United Nations A/67/73

General Assembly

Distr.: General
15 March 2012

Original: English

**Sixty-seventh session**
Item 23 of the preliminary list*
**Globalization and interdependence: international migration and development**

## Letter dated 7 March 2012 from the Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith the report of the fifth meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, which was convened in Geneva on 1 and 2 December 2011.

In accordance with General Assembly resolution 62/270, I should be grateful if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the Assembly, under item 23 of the preliminary list.

(*Signed*) Paul **Seger**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

* A/67/50.

12-26569 (E) 270412

Please recycle

**Annex to the letter dated 7 March 2012 from the Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General**

# Fifth meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development: "Taking Action on Migration and Development — Coherence, Capacity and Cooperation", Geneva, Switzerland, 1 and 2 December 2011

## Report of the proceedings of the concluding debate

## Contents


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Acknowledgements | 3 |
| II. | Introduction | 4 |
| III. | Preparatory process | 5 |
| IV. | Civil society process of the fifth meeting of the Global Forum | 8 |
| V. | Government meeting | 11 |
| | A. Opening session | 11 |
| | B. Common Space | 15 |
| VI. | Working sessions | 20 |
| | A. Cluster I: Labour mobility and development | 20 |
| | B. Cluster II: Addressing irregular migration through coherent migration-and-development strategies | 30 |
| | C. Cluster III: Tools for evidence-based migration and development policies | 34 |
| VII. | Special sessions | 43 |
| | A. Forum Assessment (phase I) | 43 |
| | B. Platform for Partnerships | 46 |
| | C. Relationship between the Global Forum and non-governmental partners | 50 |
| VIII. | Closing session | 56 |
| IX. | Conclusion | 60 |

# I. Acknowledgements*

1. With about 214 million international migrants worldwide and ever new challenges to overcome in order to achieve humane and secure circumstances for migrants as well as prosperity for their host societies and countries of origin alike, platforms for international exchange such as the Global Forum on Migration and Development are of pivotal importance for trust-building, promoting partnerships and fostering international policy coherence. It is on this note that Switzerland in 2011 accepted the honourable task of leading the Global Forum — currently the most important platform for international dialogue on migration and development.

2. The Government of Switzerland is delighted to present the present report, on the concluding Debate,[a] the final event of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, held under the auspices of Switzerland, in its capacity as Chair.

3. This report gives an account of the successful new approach taken by Switzerland. Under the central theme "Taking action on migration and development: coherence, capacity and cooperation", we sought to make 2011 a year dedicated to action. In this spirit, Switzerland organized 14 thematic meetings in various regions of the world around the three thematic clusters of the 2011 meeting of the Global Forum in close cooperation with interested States and other partners. The substantive discussions at the working sessions of the concluding debate have been particularly fruitful because of the comprehensive preparatory process preceding the final meeting. We are proud to conclude that through this process the objective of linking the local, national and regional discussions at the smaller regional thematic meetings to the global level at the 2011 Forum's concluding debate has been achieved.

4. The meeting of the 2011 Global Forum generated significant momentum within the context of the history of the Forum, owing to this innovative work approach and the completion of phase I of the Forum assessment exercise. In Puerto Vallarta, the Friends of the Forum decided to undertake a two-phased assessment of the Forum process. By conducting a survey on the existing operating modalities of the Forum, an assessment team of 14 committed Governments laid the groundwork for an informed improvement of the Forum in the future. The results of the survey demonstrated that participating States greatly appreciated the added value of the Forum in terms of promoting the exchange of knowledge and experiences.

5. Furthermore, the 2011 Forum has successfully maintained the "tried and trusted" features of the Forum. Similar to the traditional thematic round tables, the working sessions at the concluding debate provided the opportunity for in-depth discussions on migration policy matters of global relevance. Moreover, the close and fruitful exchange with non-governmental partners was sustained both by linking the civil society and the government processes and by staging a sequel to the successful Common Space in 2010 for a dynamic debate on matters of shared concern.

---

* By Eduard Gnesa, Special Ambassador for International Cooperation in Migration, Switzerland; and Chair of the fifth meeting of the Global Forum.

[a] See annex A for the programme of the concluding debate. Annexes to the present report are available from http://www.gfmd.org/en/documents-library/Switzerland-2011.html.

6. True to its motto, and through this inspiring fusion of old and new, the Forum has again been able to foster a practice-oriented dialogue on migration and development, leading to viable policy recommendations,[b] and the launch of new initiatives and partnerships.

7. The realization of the 2011 Global Forum was made possible only thanks to the dedicated efforts of all the parties involved. The ambitious approach of Switzerland, which entailed holding regional thematic meetings in preparation of the annual global event, was successful through the enthusiasm and commitment of the many Governments that hosted, chaired and co-chaired these meetings, as well as through the invaluable support received from international organizations in the preparation of the thematic meetings.

8. Moreover, the unwavering commitment of our civil society partner, the International Catholic Migration Commission, in coordinating the 2011 civil society process and successfully organizing the Civil Society Days deserves a special note of acknowledgement. In addition, Switzerland is particularly grateful to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for International Migration and Development, Peter Sutherland for his steadfast engagement in the Forum.

9. Last but not least, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Switzerland's Forum Task Force, comprising members of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, the Federal Office for Migration, the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs, the international advisers and the Forum Support Unit. Their professionalism and dedication were key to the success of Switzerland's chairmanship of the 2011 Forum.

10. On behalf of my Government, I extend my sincere gratitude to the Friends of the Forum for placing their trust in Switzerland in leading the Global Forum on Migration and Development at a crucial moment in its history, and I wish the Government of Mauritius success in continuing to guide the Forum towards a prosperous future for the benefit of migrants around the globe.

## II. Introduction

11. The Global Forum on Migration and Development is a State-led, voluntary, non-binding and informal consultative process open to all States Members of the United Nations and observer States. United Nations organizations and other international and regional bodies may be invited as observers. The Global Forum was created pursuant to the proposal of the Secretary-General at the General Assembly High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development held in September 2006. The Forum's purpose is to address the multidimensional aspects, opportunities and challenges related to international migration and its interlinkages with development, to bring together government expertise from all regions, to enhance dialogue, cooperation and partnership, and to foster practical and action-oriented outcomes at the national, regional and global levels.

12. The first meeting of the Forum was hosted by Belgium from 9 to 11 July 2007. The main goal of this meeting was to examine the impact of migration on social and economic development, in terms of human capital development and labour mobility on the one hand, and the contribution of migrant resources on the other hand.

[b] See annex B for the list of Forum outcomes and recommendations.

13. The second meeting of the Forum, which was held in Manila on 29 and 30 October 2008, revolved around the central theme, "Protecting and empowering migrants for development". The third meeting of the Forum, which was hosted by the Government of Greece and held in Athens from 2 to 5 November 2009, had the overarching theme "Integrating migration policies into development strategies for the benefit of all". The fourth meeting of the Forum, with the main theme "Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity — shared responsibility", was convened by the Government of Mexico in Puerto Vallarta from 8 to 11 November 2010.

14. In lieu of the traditional format of annual Forum meetings, the 2011 Forum provided a space for a series of smaller, focused and action-oriented meetings held around the world. By decentralizing the Forum activities and then moving "to the field", Switzerland's Chair-in-Office explored some of the practical applications of the Forum discussions at national, regional and inter-agency levels, and tapped into the concrete experiences of migration practitioners on the ground.

15. Fourteen thematic meetings were organized under three thematic clusters: labour mobility and development (cluster I); addressing irregular migration through coherent migration-and-development strategies (cluster II); and tools for evidence-based migration and development policies (cluster III). These thematic meetings built upon the content and key outcomes of previous Forum meetings and supported the Chair's flagship theme "Taking action on migration and development: coherence, capacity and cooperation". The findings of these thematic meetings were reported back to the Forum Chair and the Friends of the Forum at the 2011 concluding debate, held in Geneva on 1 and 2 December.

16. The Forum 2011 concluding debate was complemented by the Civil Society Days[c] held on 29 and 30 November, preceding the government meeting on 1 and 2 December. The Civil Society Days were coordinated by the International Catholic Migration Commission.

## III. Preparatory process

17. Under its overarching theme "Taking action on migration and development: coherence, capacity and cooperation", the 2011 Forum pursued three key objectives: (a) to focus on action by drawing on the concrete experiences of migration practitioners on the ground, (b) to do so in partnership with Forum participating Governments, while also involving regional and interregional processes and bodies, international organizations and civil society and (c) to decentralize the Forum's activities, but still present the results thereof at a transregional meeting at the end of the year, thus preserving the global character of the process.

18. To achieve these objectives, the 2011 Forum introduced a different format, which entailed a more dynamic and action-oriented preparatory process all year round. From January to October 2011, the Forum process moved to the field — to the regions and countries where Governments and other partners seek to make policies and programmes work on the ground. A series of 14 small, focused and action-

[c] See annex C for the programme of the 2011 Forum's Civil Society Days.

oriented meetings[d] were organized by Switzerland's Global Forum on Migration and Development Task Force in partnership with other Governments, the Global Migration Group and other international organizations, as well as the civil society and the private sector.

19. As in past years, the Forum workplan also included the usual preparatory meetings of the Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum in Geneva. Another priority area was the first phase of the Forum assessment process. Also included in the overall work agenda were the supporting activities of the Forum's ad hoc Working Groups on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development and the Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research — and the Forum Platform for Partnerships.

20. At the helm of the 2011 Forum was Eduard Gnesa, Switzerland's Special Ambassador for International Cooperation in Migration. He chaired all preparatory meetings of the Forum, and the concluding debate. He was assisted by a task force that included national and international experts and advisers. Four Swiss agencies formed part of the Task Force, namely, the Human Security Division, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, the Swiss Federal Office for Migration of the Federal Department of Justice and Police and the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs of the Federal Department of Economic Affairs.

21. Throughout the year, the Chair benefited from the assistance of the Forum's supporting structures: (a) the Troika, including, alongside Switzerland, the former Chair Mexico and the future Chair Sweden and, later, the successor Chair Mauritius, which provided strategic guidance to, and closely collaborated with, the Chair in Office; (b) the Steering Group, comprising 36 member countries,[e] which offered conceptual and political support; (c) the Friends of the Forum — consisting of all States Members of the United Nations and observers and specialized agencies of the United Nations system, as well as other international organizations, international foundations and regional processes — which deliberated on the agenda and format of the 2011 Forum, informed the Governments and key stakeholders of Forum-related developments and helped ensure their participation at the final meeting in December; and (d) the Support Unit, the light-support structure based in Geneva, which provided essential administrative, financial and organizational services to the Chair in Office, including financial assistance and travel facilitation for subsidized delegates, and also administered the Platform for Partnerships.

22. Furthermore, continued strategic advice and support were given to the Chair and to the overall process by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Migration and Development, Peter Sutherland, who participated in meetings of the various Forum bodies — the Assessment Team, the Steering Group and the Friends

[d] Information on the thematic meetings is available from http://www.gfmd.org/en/documents-library/switzerland-2011.html.

[e] In September, the Government of Mauritius joined the Forum's Steering Group, which also included Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

of the Forum — during the year. He also chaired the special session on the Forum assessment at the 2011 concluding debate.

23. Indeed, the Forum travelled the world in 2011, not only by organizing the 14 regional thematic meetings, but also by participating in related events on international migration, such as the Abu Dhabi Dialogue in January, the United Nations Coordination Meeting on International Migration in February, the informal thematic debate organized by the President of the General Assembly in New York in May, the Colombo Process Ministerial Meeting in Dhaka in April, the Global Migration Group Principals Meeting in Paris in November and the Global Regional Consultative Processes on Migration Meeting in Botswana in October. In all of these engagements, the Chair sought the cooperation of other Governments, civil society representatives and international organizations to help ensure a successful 2011 Forum.

24. In the lead-up to the 2011 concluding debate, the Chair called three meetings of the Friends of the Forum and four meetings of the Steering Group.[f] These meetings discussed the Chair's concept paper and workplan, provided updates on the progress of the thematic meetings, addressed issues related to the future of the Forum, such as the funding situation and future chairmanships, called for sustained financial support, and informed all stakeholders about the progress of preparations for the concluding debate.

25. The Chair also convened eight meetings of the 14-member Global Forum on Migration and Development Assessment Team,[g] which deliberated on the modalities of the first phase of the assessment exercise, mandated an expert from Switzerland for the survey on the Forum, helped prepare the assessment questionnaire, and drafted the assessment report based on the responses of 66 Governments and 10 Forum observers.

26. The substantive agenda and work programme of the concluding debate were structured around the three 2011 Forum cluster themes. Each of the 14 thematic meetings produced a summary report which was posted on the Forum web portal after each event. In August, three Government teams were formed, involving 24 Governments in total, most of which co-chaired the various thematic meetings. In coordination with Switzerland's Task Force, these Government teams prepared the cluster summary reports[h] which served as background papers for the concluding debate.

27. To promote a collective sense of ownership of and responsibility for the Forum process, the Chair called on all Governments to provide financial assistance to the Forum. In February, the Chair presented to the Friends of the Forum a core budget of 2,155,232 United States dollars which for the first time brought together all related Forum costs, including the Support Unit operation. Twelve Governments stepped

[f] The calendar of 2011 Forum activities is available from http://www.gfmd.org/en/documents-library/switzerland-2011.html.

[g] The Global Forum on Migration and Development Assessment Team included 14 Governments representing key regions: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, India, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates. Mauritius joined the Assessment Team as of its 7th, meeting on 27 September 2011.

[h] The cluster summary reports are available from http://www.gfmd.org/en/documents-library/switzerland-2011.html.

forward and offered financial assistance amounting to about US$ 1,280,487.[i] The funding gap was bridged by the Government of Switzerland.

28. The Government of Switzerland also shouldered the bulk of organizational expenses associated with the 14 thematic meetings. Some of these meetings were supported, financially and in kind, by other Governments, international organizations, civil society organizations and other related entities.[j] The Chair likewise contributed to the civil society process and funded the assessment exercise.

29. Running in parallel with the government process was the civil society process, which was coordinated by the International Catholic Migration Commission, upon the invitation of the Government of Switzerland. The Commission worked with a core group of 15 civil society leaders and consulted with over 200 diverse individuals and organizations in developing the themes and programmes of the Civil Society Days, held in Geneva on 29 and 30 November. A link between the civil society and the government process was achieved through a report on the Civil Society Days at the opening session of the concluding debate, followed by the Common Space.

## IV. Civil society process of the fifth meeting of the Global Forum

30. Civil society actors are often the unsung heroes of the migration and development story, the important judges of policies, the unofficial implementers of activities, the advocates of migrants' rights and the promoters of migrants in their capacity as agents of development and change at the negotiating table. Therefore the Chair, in 2011, emphasized meaningful interaction with civil society, which included the following aspects:

### Independence of the civil society process

31. The concept paper of the GFMD civil society programme for 2011 begins by stating: "For the first time in five years of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, civil society has the possibility to design its own focus and programme of activities within the GFMD process." Thus, the 2011 Forum civil society agenda, largely based on the needs of its diverse representations and with direct references to the government agenda, was comprehensive and designed to ensure more ownership by civil society itself and to offer more opportunities for dialogue with Governments.

32. Upon the invitation of the Chair, the International Catholic Migration Commission took responsibility for coordinating the civil society process in its entirety, working together on the themes and outlines for the civil society activities with a core group of 15 civil society leaders and consulting with over 200 diverse individuals and organizations.

---

[i] This is based on a preliminary financial report on the 2011 Forum meeting, prepared jointly by the Forum Support Unit and the International Organization for Migration, host of the Support Unit.

[j] See annex D for the acknowledgement of contributions to the 2011 Forum.

**Partnership**

33. By identifying a direct interlocutor within civil society to coordinate the process in 2011, the Chair entrusted civil society with its own responsibility for the Forum, with a view to building a partnership of trust. In establishing a direct partnership with the International Catholic Migration Commission, the Chair intended to initiate a more sustainable set-up for engagement with civil society organizations in an in-depth manner, so as to ensure more continuity in the dialogue, more effectiveness in the collaboration, and more endurance and success for the Forum.

**Regular dialogue between civil society and Governments**

34. The civil society was able to participate in different meetings throughout the year. Various civil society representatives participated in a number of thematic meetings which were held around the world even if the primary target audience were government officials. These workshops witnessed the participation of a variety of civil society stakeholders including migrant-led and diaspora organizations, development organizations, migrant rights groups, academia, the private sector and other organizations related to the broader migration and development context.

35. The two joint symposiums convened at the end of August and October entailing interaction between Governments and civil society offered a space for Switzerland and international civil society and Governments to brainstorm with Governments, academics, international organizations and each other with respect to Forum issues, namely, the outcomes of the 2010 Forum in Mexico, the connections between those outcomes and the thematic programme for the 2011 Forum, the role of civil society in the Forum, and how to build on the efforts of 2010 so as to strengthen interaction between civil society and Governments in the 2011 Forum.

36. Furthermore, the Common Space aimed at achieving constructive, honest and transparent dialogue between Governments and civil society; to explore, inspire and generate new forms of cooperation and to build common ground in respect of finding alternatives to irregular migration in the context of demographic and youth (un-)employment trends.

37. Lastly, the opportunities for Governments to engage in meetings with representatives of civil society from their respective countries, as organized under the auspices of the Civil Society Days, were used to great satisfaction by a number of Governments.

**Inclusion of Switzerland's civil society in the global process**

38. The Chair ensured that Switzerland's civil society actors were able to build on the experience of their engagement in the 2011 Forum. The participation of Switzerland's civil society actors in the process allowed them to better organize themselves and clarify their positions on the themes of the 2011 Forum. As a result, the recommendations of Switzerland's civil society are certain to inspire a new and improved debate on migration and development within Switzerland.

**Civil Society Days**

39. The 2011 Forum Civil Society Days, held on 29 and 30 November, witnessed the participation of numerous Government representatives. The two days of working

sessions built upon the recommendations of past Forum meetings and brought to light new concerns, which were then presented in the civil society statement to Governments during the opening session of the concluding debate.[k]

40. The statement, presented by the Civil Society Days Chair, William Gois, Migrant Forum Asia, focused on irregular migration, family unity and labour mobility. Reflecting the deliberations of the more than 180 civil society participants from around the world, the statement called for an end to the criminalization of irregular migration. The statement also emphasized that circular and temporary labour migration schemes should not replace permanent employment and should include pathways to permanent residence status and citizenship.

41. Some important facts and figures regarding the 2011 Civil Society Days are given below.

**Participation in the Civil Society Days**

42. While a total of 625 applications from civil society organizations were registered, the International Catholic Migration Commission in consultation with a core group of 15 civil society representatives selected 186 civil society delegates, representing 61 different nationalities. Of the total number of selected delegates, 73 were migrants, while 50 served as speakers and panellists. Also participating in the Civil Society Days were 45 observers from regional and international organizations, 43 special guests, 71 Government delegates from 35 countries and 18 media representatives.

**Delegate diversity**

43. For the first time in the five years of the Forum's existence, the largest number of delegates (38) were from diaspora/migrant-led organizations. The second largest number of delegates (34) were from human rights organizations, followed by those from development organizations, labour organizations, academia and think tanks, and the private sector. Sixteen delegates represented Switzerland's civil society organizations. Ninety-five delegates were male and 91 were female; 88 of the participating organizations had been active in Africa, 82 in Europe, 79 in the Americas, 77 in Asia and the Pacific and 51 in the Middle East.

**Geographical and thematic scope**

44. Eighty-seven of the delegates' organizations worked at the global level, 102 at the regional level, 124 at the national level and 88 at the local level. The selected civil society organizations had a diversity of thematic foci encompassing regularization of undocumented migrants, family unity and reunification, the right to "not migrate" and re-migrate, increasing positive alternatives to irregular migration, including jobs creation in countries of origin and legal channels of migration, the increasing role of diaspora for development, key agents of change in labour migration, "labour matching", temporary and circular migration and other operational mechanisms of labour migration, and the International Labour Organization (ILO) Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration.

[k] See annex E for the statement on the Civil Society Days.

# V. Government meeting

## A. Opening session

45. The 2011 Forum concluding debate was opened by the Chair of the 2011 Forum, Ambassador Eduard Gnesa, in the presence of the head of Switzerland's Federal Department of Justice and Police, Federal Councillor Simonetta Sommaruga; the Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs; the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for International Migration and Development, Peter Sutherland; the Assistant Director for the Social and Human Sciences, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Pilar Alvarez-Laso, representing the Global Migration Group; and the Regional Coordinator of the Migrant Forum in Asia and Chair of the 2011 Forum Civil Society Days, William Gois.

46. The Chair warmly welcomed some 600 delegates from about 160 countries and 36 Forum observers, as well as about 120 civil society representatives. In his opening address, he observed that the Global Forum has helped shape the global debate on migration and development. Through its inclusive approach, ongoing consultations and follow-up activities, the Forum has evolved into a process rather than remaining just an annual conference. He added that the annual meetings have in their own ways created a basis available to Governments and other actors for dealing more effectively with the contributions that migration can make to development.

47. The Chair had taken the Forum one step further in 2011 by providing a space for a series of small and focused thematic meetings organized in different parts of the world. Under the overarching theme "Taking action on migration and development: coherence, capacity and cooperation", three broad areas were considered, namely, labour mobility and development; addressing irregular migration through coherent migration-and-development strategies; and tools for evidence-based migration and development policies.

48. The Forum had travelled the world in 2011 by hosting 14 workshops in Dubai, Kingston, Accra, Dhaka, Berne, Abuja, San Salvador, Istanbul, Marseille (France), New York, Batumi, Taroudant (Morocco), Chişinău and Manila. These meetings were attended by over 1,200 participants representing Governments, international organizations and civil society. Through these workshops, the Forum has gathered a great wealth of knowledge and information on best practices. This material was discussed during the two-day concluding debate.

49. The Chair expressed confidence that the six thematic working sessions of the concluding debate, through the guidance of the working session Co-Chairs, would result in an interactive and open debate on the issues at stake, producing innovative conclusions and concrete outcomes supportive of migration and development policies on the national, regional and global levels. The concluding debate also aimed at discussing the second phase of the Forum assessment, to be carried out in 2012. A special session on the Platform for Partnerships would examine the progress it had achieved to date and where it was headed in the future. Finally, the new session on the relationship between the Forum and non-governmental partners would aim at providing a better understanding and management of the connections between migration and development.

50. In her keynote speech, Ms. Sommaruga discussed why migration was beneficial to the development of Switzerland. According to her, migration is never just good or bad. It is about compromises and pragmatic weighing of costs and benefits. Switzerland is deeply engaged in the Forum because of its national interest, which should be the starting point of any national migration policy.

51. She cautioned, however, that a country that tries to develop a migration policy without looking beyond its own borders will fail. In this regard, it was necessary for Switzerland to find partners from across the globe to help address the challenges it was facing; but this would be possible only if Switzerland were to seriously consider the challenges of its partners. Citing the example of Switzerland's partnership with Guinea on migration issues, she conveyed Switzerland's short-term interest in good cooperation on issues of return and readmission, but emphasized that it is also in the explicit interest of Switzerland that migration should not occur out of necessity, owing to poverty and hardship. A good outcome could be achieved only if there were real prospects at home. National interest can be better addressed through international cooperation than through national stand-alone policies. She urged that protection and defence of human dignity should be at the heart of migration policies, adding that migrants must not be treated as a commodity or a bargaining chip.

52. Finally, she emphasized that migration was and is indispensable for Switzerland's development. Economic development attracted many innovative people who have been crucial to Switzerland's becoming one of the wealthiest countries on earth, making it a net country of destination. At the same time, for centuries Switzerland has been, above all, a country of origin, with 11 per cent of Swiss citizens living abroad even today.

53. Ms. Sommaruga welcomed all participants at the concluding debate and left them with a challenge — to think "out of the box" and to seek, find and implement new and better ways of working together for the sake of their common interests.

54. After the keynote address, the Chair called on the Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs to introduce the video message of the Secretary-General. The Assistant Secretary-General praised the Chair for organizing 14 thematic meetings through having adopted a pioneering approach directed towards a more focused and action-oriented Global Forum. While remaining faithful to the State-led nature of the Forum, the 2011 Forum had worked with international organizations and civil society in organizing those meetings and built synergies among all concerned stakeholders. He also recognized that under the able leadership of Switzerland, the first phase of the assessment had been brought to a successful conclusion, the report of which clearly showed that the Global Forum has been highly successful in advancing informal and concrete dialogue between participating States.

55. The Assistant Secretary-General reported that, on 19 May 2011, the President of the General Assembly had organized an informal thematic debate on international migration and development, where the presentation of advances made by the Global Forum informed and enriched the debate, and had showcased various national initiatives designed to lower the transfer costs of remittances, to engage transnational communities in development efforts, and to foster circular migration. This informal thematic debate demonstrated that the State-led Global Forum and the United Nations can mutually reinforce each other.

56. Suggesting that more needs to be done, he pointed to the assessment results which indicated that there is room to improve the exchange of best practices at country levels and to strengthen partnerships between Governments and other stakeholders. He believed that the United Nations and the Global Migration Group can play a key role in this regard; and cited the report of the Secretary-General on international migration and development prepared for the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly (A/65/203), which illustrated how the Group has, over the years, increased its efforts to implement Global Forum outcomes. He advocated for Group members with field offices to jointly assist member States in examining the regional and country-specific aspects of international migration and its relationship to development. He also urged all member States to work closely with Mr. Sutherland in preparing the agenda of the second High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2013 in order to help ensure its success. He anticipated that in late 2012, the Assembly would adopt a resolution on the modalities of the 2013 High-level Dialogue. For this purpose, an information note[1] on the preparatory process for the High-level Dialogue was made available during the meeting.

57. In a two-minute video message, the Secretary-General complimented the Global Forum for meeting at a crucial time, when remittances surpass foreign direct investments (FDIs) in many developing countries. Yet, too many migrants face exclusion, discrimination, violence and other vulnerabilities, as shown in the recent uprisings in North Africa. He thus challenged the Forum to find ways to leverage migration for the common good.

58. He encouraged the Forum to help migrants move safely and legally, protect their rights, and encourage their contributions to the countries that they have left and the countries in which they live.

59. The Secretary-General commended the Forum for having advanced initiatives aimed at reducing the cost of remittances and empowering migrants, and for making it possible for the migrants to return home. He called on everyone to build on the achievements of the Forum in order to make the most of the High-level Dialogue in 2013. He expressed the hope that all Forum actors will be equally brave in finding ways to make migration work for development. On this note, he expressed his best wishes for the great success of the concluding debate.

60. Speaking on behalf of UNESCO, current Chair of the Global Migration Group, Ms. Pilar Alvarez-Laso congratulated Switzerland for successfully chairing the 2011 meeting of the Forum. She praised the Chair for having introduced innovations to the format, modalities and content of the Forum. She also expressed satisfaction at the close cooperation between the Global Migration Group and the Forum in 2011, which had afforded the Group the opportunity to show how significantly it can contribute to the Global Forum process.

61. Ms. Alvarez-Laso also congratulated the Government of Mauritius for offering to assume the presidency of the Forum for 2012. She assured the Government of Mauritius that the Global Migration Group stands ready to provide it with all the support needed to make the 2012 Forum a success.

[1] See the information note on "International migration and development at the UN", available from www.gfmd.org.

62. She reported that in 2011, the Global Migration Group had worked with a wide range of stakeholders to tackle the challenges and harness the benefits of international migration. In carrying out its work, the Group has adopted a wide perspective, encompassing policy-relevant research, analysis of global trends and implementation-related support to international legal instruments aimed at protecting migrant workers and members of their families, and refugees, as well as victims of migrant smuggling and human trafficking.

63. She looked back 10 years to the time when there was neither the Global Forum nor the Global Migration Group, and when the issue of migration was raised only on the margins of global policy debates. In the last decade, according to her, major steps had been taken by the international community to address migration issues. Today, States exchange good practices and cooperate at the international level. Both States and non-State actors are adopting a comprehensive approach to migration, addressing its many dimensions, including development, social transformation, decent work, social inclusion, human rights and, increasingly, climate change.

64. In closing, Ms. Alvarez-Laso enjoined all stakeholders to recognize migration as a key strategy of adaptation to environmental changes, and to take account of environmental factors in immigration policies.

65. The statement of the 2011 Civil Society Days held on 29 and 30 November 2011 was delivered by Mr. Gois.

66. Mr. Gois reminded all member States that human mobility is an unstoppable global phenomenon and that there is a need for the global community to better respond to that phenomenon. To this end, 186 civil society delegates from 61 countries, including 73 migrants — representing the largest number of diaspora and migrant organizations participating in the Forum to date — had met in Geneva, along with 160 observers, guests and Governments during the Civil Society Days of the 2011 Forum. The two-day deliberations focused on labour migration, development alternatives to migration, and the protection of migrant workers and their families, their scope complementing that of the agenda of the government meeting.

67. The highlights of the Forum 2011 civil society statement are presented directly below:

- Global governance and rights: Civil society agreed that any emerging global governance system must have an indisputable basis in normative frameworks. It also urged ILO to show new energy and new commitment to organizing practical and rights-based approaches to labour migration required in the context of the long-overdue review of labour migration in itself and not just for development, and for the protection of native workers as well as migrant workers, and their families.

- Reimagining labour mobility: Delegates reiterated points made in previous Civil Society Days, namely, that circular and temporary labour migration schemes should not replace permanent employment and should include pathways to permanent residence status and citizenship. They also emphasized the need to focus on development needs of countries of origin through financing-for-development commitments made by developed countries, so that labour migration would no longer be a necessity for many workers.

- Family migration: Civil society called on Governments to ensure that the right to family unity and reunification and the well-being of the family are the cornerstones of migration policies. Support systems for transnational families designed to mitigate the hardship caused by migration must be implemented, including child protection systems and access to education, services, psychological support, health insurance and investment.

- Irregular migration: Civil society reaffirmed its view that Governments must stop the criminalization of migrants with irregular status. They also urged Governments to reallocate resources from border controls to enforcement of labour standards so as to protect all workers and reduce the economic incentives to hire and exploit irregular migrants.

- Human and economic development: Civil society criticized development programmes and assistance that focus more on efforts to repatriate irregular migrants than on real, broad development. When it comes to linkages between migrant diasporas and local sending communities, it is important to involve local stakeholders, create relationships built on trust, remove red tape, speed up decisions on project funding, and encourage direct partnership between diasporas and the private sector.

- Migrant and diaspora empowerment: Migrants' participation in the development of policy should be guaranteed. Governments have the responsibility to promote and practice dialogue with civil society; therefore, there should be a space for consultation. Networks could be created at the regional level for advocacy with authorities.

- Future of the Forum: The High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development is a pivotal event and civil society is eager to play an integral role in the preparations and outcomes. Civil society also affirmed that the primary concern is the future of migrants, more than the future of the Forum.

## B. Common Space

68. The fourth meeting of the Forum held in Mexico in 2010 introduced the Common Space as an interactive session which engaged a cross-section of panellists and delegates from Governments, civil society and international organizations. The Common Space was widely perceived as a positive contribution to joint engagement, conversation and cooperation among those actors.

69. Building upon the successful experience in Mexico, the Common Space, at the opening session of the concluding debate, held on 1 December, was organized, with the same objectives and along similar lines, together with the 2011 Forum civil society coordinator, the International Catholic Migration Commission. The proposed theme of the Common Space was "Looking at the big picture: demographics, youth (un-)employment, development and migration".[m]

70. Under the guidance of a skilled moderator, the Common Space was structured around a three-hour plenary, with two parts: (a) a brief opening presentation offering

[m] See annex F for the format of the Forum's 2011 Common Space. Further documentation of the Common Space is available from http://www.gfmd.org/en/documents-library/switzerland-2011.html.

a data-centred, dynamic snapshot of "the big picture" of demographics, youth (unemployment), development and migration; and (b) a panel discussion on alternatives to irregular migration, focusing on two complementary chapters: (i) sustainable development, job creation and safe and legal avenues for migration and (ii) regularization and measures to remedy and reduce the demand for irregular migration.

71. Each chapter of the panel discussion included a number of Government and civil society panellists, as well as a discussant from an international organization.

72. The moderator, Zeinab Badawi, a BBC journalist, opened the Common Space session with a few thought-provoking introductory remarks. She reminded participants of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, held in Durban, South Africa, over 10 years before, where the discussions on racist and xenophobic tendencies towards migrants had featured prominently. In discussions pertaining to migrants and particularly irregular migrants, there was a prevailing sense that people forgot the principles of anti-racism. It was time to have a wider debate on migration, to remember the existence of real people behind the statistics and headlines, and to realize that negative attitudes towards migrants reinforced existing prejudices towards people of colour, regardless of their status. It is important to break this conspiracy of silence on irregular migration, where people may be criminalized because of their status, and where "solidarity" with such migrants is criminalized. Ms. Badawi hoped for a vigorous, provocative and frank exchange on a topic that, for a long time, has been only portrayed by silence.

73. This was followed by an expert presentation on the overarching theme "Looking at the big picture: demographics, youth, (un-)employment, development and migration" by Rainer Münz, an expert on population change, international migration, and demographic ageing and their economic impacts and implications for social security. Mr. Münz examined the facts and figures of current demographic and workforce developments, and unemployment rates, especially of youth around the world, and how these scenarios affect or are affected by migration and development today and how they will affect or be affected by migration and development in the future.

74. Currently at 7 billion, the world population was growing exponentially, albeit unevenly, in the various continents. The main contributors to this growing population are Asia and Africa. There has been a decline in population from Western Europe to Japan and this will continue to be a feature of the demographic trends in these parts of the world. The number of elderly citizens will have tripled to 1.5 billion by the middle of the twenty-first century. This increase in life expectancy and declining fertility are two factors that are also increasingly playing an important role in global demographic trends. As a consequence, the labour market is affected. The number of economically active people are shrinking in the West, thus creating an imbalance in the divergent trends of domestic labour markets. On the other hand, many countries with an abundant labour force, such as those in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, are seeing a continuous growth in the youth population. Unemployment statistics are hard to compare. While many individuals work informally, the data differ significantly in the formal sector.

75. Approximately 215 million people in the world constituting 3 per cent of the total world population, are migrants. Remittances and investments are the most

measurable benefits of international migration. Migrants are agents of international finance and are responsible for the money that is directly channelled to private households. Brain drain is a prevailing challenge in countries of origin, as a considerable proportion of their highly educated people live abroad.

76. 20-30 million people have an irregular status. Most cross borders legally but administrative defaults, such as the expiration of visas, drive them to irregularity. Today, to combat irregular migration, some countries build physical defences in the form of walls and fences in an attempt to keep people out. Others try to discourage migration through administrative barriers and by attempting to control the phenomenon through national legislations, but with little success, and the trends continue to rise.

77. The development of fair mobility partnerships, skills-building and skills-matching, appropriate migration programmes including circular migration programmes and smart migration policies, are among the more effective and efficient means of helping to address the interlinked demographic and livelihood issues leading to irregular migration. However, as per Mr. Münz's suggestions, the basis for implementation of all of the above methods comprises three core principles: migrants are not to be discriminated against; migrants and nationals of the receiving countries should not be competing; and migrants should have the chance to integrate well and stay if they wish to, in order to better contribute to the development of their home country and their society of residence.

78. The expert's presentation was followed by a panel discussion on the topic: "Alternatives to irregular migration". The panellists for the first session on "Sustainable development, job creation and safe and legal avenues for migration" included Anaclet Kalibata, Director General of Immigration and Emigration, Ministry in the Office of the President, Government of Rwanda; Crecentia Mofokeng, Regional Representative for Africa and the Middle East, Building and Woodworkers International (BWI); and Göran Hultin, Chief Executive Officer, Caden Corporation. The discussant was Azfar Khan, Senior Migration Specialist at ILO.

79. Mr. Kalibata elaborated on the fact that job creation in a country like Rwanda remains an issue. However, people are not forced to migrate. It is their choice. Jobs should be created at a very basic level. The development of appropriate skills, empowerment of women, providing better education, and engaging young people to be innovative are all necessary factors in job creation. Brain drain may be a sensitive issue, since, for example, many doctors educated in Rwanda look for jobs elsewhere, thus creating a shortage of doctors in Rwanda itself. However, sending countries like Rwanda do benefit from remittances. He also noted that Rwanda is itself a country of migrants and has existing policies to support migrants in the form of permanent residency, nationality and dual citizenship.

80. Ms. Mofokeng mentioned that the issue of the lack of decent work exists in various countries where BWI works as a global union movement to promote decent pay and decent working conditions, a meaningful job with prospects, a good working environment, continuous human resource development and secure employment. Many have to leave their countries of origin because of precarious employment conditions. Governments should create decent employment opportunities for people in their own countries so that migration remains a choice. Another major issue is dealing with recruitment agencies which take advantage of

unfortunate migrant workers, some of whom end up in irregular situations. The recognition of skills, need for social protection, more dialogue between social partners, better investments by government in public services, and access to education and vocational training in countries that need skills are some of the job creation-related issues requiring solutions.

81. Mr. Hultin indicated that the private sector plays an important role in the area of job creation and that this issue is currently being discussed in the World Economic Forum Global Agenda Council on Migration. All over the world, the private sector is grappling with shortage of skills. This is especially true in the current turbulent economic context. It has to be accepted that migration is indeed one of the solutions and has to be viewed in the context of overall labour-market policies. Therefore, the main issue is to implement appropriate labour migration programmes. However, this can be achieved only if the recruitment process in the country of origin is not disconnected from the employment process in the country of destination.

82. Panellists and participants stressed the need for better regulation, accountability and transparency of recruitment agencies. International labour standards, including ILO Convention No. 181, needed to be enforced. Governments should ensure that migrant workers have the same labour rights as local workers.

83. Mr. Khan concluded that employment and job creation are crucial concerns, since there is a need for monetary resources to satisfy our basic needs, including food, clothing and health. People can afford these necessities only if they are employed. It therefore becomes a moral obligation and responsibility of the Government to provide employment. ILO believes that migration takes place because of gaps in decent work and lack of employment. Therefore, if livelihoods are destroyed people start looking elsewhere. Political will, good governance and the need for institutionalized solutions are therefore a necessity in job creation.

84. The panellists for the second chapter, on "Regularization and measures to remedy and reduce the demand for irregular migration", included Izaura Maria Soares Miranda, Director of the Department for Foreigners, Ministry of Justice, Government of Brazil; Joanna Sosnowska, European Migration Network National Contact Point, Ministry of Interior and Administration, Government of Poland; and Michele LeVoy, Executive Director, Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants. The discussant was Albert Kraler, Research Officer, International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD).

85. The panellists and audience actively participated in discussing the measures and best options for remedying and reducing the demand for irregular migration. Regularization, in particular, as a measure through which to remedy irregular migration, drew passionate statements from Governments and civil society alike.

86. Ms. Soares stated that the Government of Brazil believes that the differences in culture lead to the construction of an enriched and harmonious society that is free of discrimination and prejudice. On many occasions, Brazil has incentivized immigration by offering benefits to migrant workers, including Italian immigrants in coffee plantations, the Japanese in agriculture and farming, the Germans in industry, and the Lebanese, Syrians and Turks in commerce. A constitutional approach was used in 1988 to help foreigners assimilate. This led Brazil to promote amnesty for a considerable number of foreigners without a regular status. Brazil sought to

regularize irregular migrants rather than criminalize them. Restrictive national legislation fosters more irregular migration and criminalization of irregular migrants fosters crime. Regularization therefore benefits both the migrants and the countries of destination.

87. Ms. Sosnowska mentioned that in Europe, on the other hand, regularization indeed continues to remain a sensitive topic. This issue creates a great deal of negative emotions, especially in those sections of the society whose members feel that regularization will give rise to an inflow of irregular migrants in Europe. It is important to create coherent policies on migration involving all European Union (EU) member States.

88. Ms. LeVoy noted that while Governments need to define which category of migrants could be offered regularization as a channel for legalizing their stay, it is important to look first at how people become irregular and why regularization mechanisms are needed. The most common path into irregularity is through bureaucratic failures in addressing residence and work permits, inefficient renewals and associated procedures. On many occasions, the work permit is tied to a single employer, resulting in the exploitation of workers at the hands of their employers. If the workers lodged complaints against such employers, their work permits could be revoked, leading to irregularity. Regularization is one of the means of addressing these problems. However, the schemes needed safeguards and mechanisms so that they did not create further irregularity.

89. The contribution of undocumented migrants to the economy was also emphasized. These migrants are also persons with social and political capital. Irregular status depoliticizes a substantial part of the population, thereby discounting them as active citizens. It is important to recognize that the majority of irregular migrants are strongly dissatisfied with their status and want to contribute to development. Racist discourse on irregular migrants, usage of incorrect terminology like "illegal migrants" and negative media coverage needed to be challenged.

90. Addressing labour standards is a key method for reducing the demand for irregular migration. Reallocation of resources from border security to labour inspection needed to be envisaged. A crucial aspect of enforcing labour standards is to focus on the protection of the rights of undocumented migrant workers.

91. Mr. Kraler concluded that regularization is being used by different Governments and is important as one of the elements of migration policy for dealing with irregular migration. While it may be deemed a "fix" to the problem, it does not solve the problem. There needs to be a continuous revision of policies according to the realities of migration trends. Each country needs to define its own regularization programmes, depending on its needs. States needed to recognize that in certain cases, the return of irregular migrants to their countries of origin might not be feasible. This is true from both a human rights perspective and a migration management and development point of view. In such cases, it would be inhumane to leave people in limbo in terms of development or their integration into a country.

92. It must be kept in mind that regularization is not a magic tool and does not do away with all the ills associated with irregular migration. Receiving countries also needed to ensure that regular migrants did not fall into irregularity owing to

administrative factors. Hence, immigration law has to be strongly anchored in international human rights law.

93. The expert, Mr. Münz, concluded that international migration will continue to remain a necessity in the real world. It is important to look at the youth dimension of international migration. More qualified youth are unable to find jobs in their country of origin, which has also been one of the major factors that led to "Arab Spring" which began in early 2011. The issue of irregular migration cannot be solved without continuous and constructive dialogue between all stakeholders. Receiving countries should be as committed to dialogue as the sending countries and civil society organizations representing migrants' interests. The Government of Mauritius should seek to continue to promote such a dialogue during its chairmanship of the 2012 Forum.

94. Sending countries should set an example by granting rights to people in their own countries. Sending countries should also do their utmost to support and assist their diasporas through diplomatic channels. Receiving countries should use regularization as a possible first step towards remedying irregular migration. Another way of addressing the issue would be to reduce the demand for irregular migrants. This can be achieved by cracking down on the employers who hire migrants with an irregular status. Both sending and receiving countries and civil society representatives should look continuously at best practices, ensure the implementation of such practices and share information with a view to learning from each other.

# VI. Working sessions

## A. Cluster I: Labour mobility and development[n]

*Cluster Rapporteur*: Nahida Sobhan, Minister, Permanent Mission of Bangladesh to the United Nations office and other international organizations in Geneva

*Coordinator*: Irena Omelaniuk, Senior Adviser to the Chair-in-Office

95. Cluster I dealt with three key development-related challenges that arise in the context of labour mobility: how to promote greater engagement by the private sector in labour-market planning; how to lower the costs of migration for higher development gains; and the specific case of global domestic workers at the interface of migration and development. It expanded on a number of outcomes from earlier Forum meetings and studies conducted by the Forum ad hoc Working Group on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development, particularly in regard to labour recruitment costs, social protection of temporary labour migrants, gender and family, and the global care-worker industry.

96. The working sessions benefited from the outcomes of six workshops on the three themes, held in Bangladesh, Dubai, Ghana, Jamaica, Nigeria and Switzerland,

[n] For further background details on the themes of these working sessions, refer to the cluster I summary report, prepared in consultation with a Government team comprising members from Bangladesh, Canada, Ghana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Nigeria, the Philippines, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates. Available from http://gfmd.org/en/documents-library/switzerland-2011.

which engaged Governments, civil society, the private sector and international organizations. Building on the outcomes of the workshops, the cluster I working sessions discussed practical strategies for making labour migration work better for the human development of migrants and families, and the economic development of their home and host countries. The debates also profited from the collaboration and input of the World Trade Institute, IOM, ILO, UN-Women, the World Bank, the International Centre for Migration Policy Development and other international organizations and experts in this field.

**Working session 1.1: Engaging the private sector in labour-market planning**

*Co-Chairs*: Uthman Jauhar, Minister, Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka to the United Nations office and other international organizations in Geneva; and Gottfried Zürcher, Director for Migration Policy, Federal Office for Migration, Switzerland

*Rapporteur*: Malin Frankenhaeuser, Adviser to the Forum Chair-in-Office

97. This session reflected the Chair's efforts in 2011 to redress the gaps in dialogue and cooperation between government and the private sector on migration and development matters, also in the context of the Forum. The discussion was informed by the outcomes of the thematic meeting,[o] which drew together Governments, business, business with social responsibility (BSR) trade experts, civil society and international organizations to enable them to explore strategies and practices for closer collaboration.

98. The session addressed three questions: how Governments can better reflect private sector demand in labour-market and migration planning; how companies can participate more in the development of countries of origin of migrant workers; and how the private sector can become more involved in international dialogue on migration and development issues.

*Issues and observations*

99. Governments reaffirmed the need to involve the private sector in assessing and planning labour-market needs and, where appropriate, immigration programmes to help meet those needs, for the developmental benefit of all involved. Business was an important "partner in development", in countries of both origin and destination; but new policy and institutional frameworks were needed to enable such partnerships. Knowing their national labour market was a precondition for the devising by Governments of effective policies on comprehensive international labour mobility. This required both the capacity to conduct labour-market assessments and enabling support structures such as the following:

- Public employment agencies which maintain an overview of available jobs and job-seekers. In some countries, these agencies work effectively with skills databases or registries
- Tripartite consultation mechanisms (committees and platforms), comprising employers, trade unions and the Government, for determining the demand for

[o] The thematic meeting on this theme was entitled "Markets for migration and development (M4MD): trade and labour mobility linkages — prospects for development?", held from 13 to 15 September 2011 in Berne.

labour immigration and setting yearly quotas and/or for reacting directly to employers' requests

- Employer demand-driven labour migration systems (as constituting a fairly new approach, these still need to be fully assessed)

100. There was a clear message from the session that Governments had a primary role to play in managing labour mobility around real labour-market needs, inter alia, because of their responsibility for combating unemployment and ensuring that employer demand-driven immigration programmes did not cause further unemployment and tax burdens for the community. Governments like the Philippines and Eritrea see bilateral agreements as effective tools with which to structure labour recruitment around agreed labour needs. Some Governments pursue tripartite negotiations as a quick and efficient way to achieve consensual policies. Sweden's new demand-driven labour system does not rely on a points system or quotas, and enables employers to hire the right person for the job, also from beyond the EU space and from among foreign students. The effectiveness of this approach still needs to be tested.

101. Participants agreed that optimal development outcomes can be achieved only when labour mobility is a matter of choice rather than of necessity. They considered some practical incentives through which the private sector could help retain skills and prevent brain drain, especially in countries undergoing a transition from informal to formal labour markets, and from unskilled to skilled workforces. The needs are different in each country. For example, in Lebanon, where there is a dearth of jobs for the highly skilled, the Government provides low-interest loans to small and medium-sized companies in tourism, health and other sectors so as to create high-level jobs. In South Africa, where skills are scarce in some sectors, the Government has adopted an action plan on labour, which includes a registry of skilled persons, career counselling and training, and matching employers' salary for employees in training. The Czech Republic recognizes that its private sector needs to be better informed about the migration laws and programmes before it can become a viable partner.

102. Participants agreed that Governments in destination countries could consider offering companies incentives to invest more in the countries of origin of migrant workers. For example, the Government of Switzerland encourages Switzerland-based multinational companies to provide local workforces with training that goes beyond their own needs in those countries, and transnational businesses to facilitate more intra-company transfers. Sweden and other countries are seeking to strengthen incentives of diasporas to invest in their countries of origin. The use of information technology to inform migrants and mobilize diasporas to invest in job creation back home, and the negotiation of intercountry social security agreements, were some key strategies proposed to strengthen public-private cooperation across borders.

103. Cross-sectoral collaboration between the public and private sectors remains elusive, since each has different interests, time perspectives and obligations: Governments need to ensure long-term positive human and socio-economic development, and business operates under shorter-term economic imperatives. The private sector also represents a diffuse spectrum of players, including employers, business, multinational companies, manpower agencies, subcontractors and BSR. And each country has its specific governance challenges. The private sector has also been cautious about engaging with the Forum, which may be somewhat too informal

for its purposes. Participants agreed there was a need for more trust and confidence between Government and the private sector; and the Forum could continue the dialogue with a view to strengthening relations through promotion of a better understanding of the objectives and the process of the Forum.

*Outcomes and recommendations*

104. The following outcomes and recommendations emerged from the working session:

1. Governments in destination countries could offer companies seeking to invest in emerging markets incentives to help train the local workforce (beyond their immediate needs), for example, by match-funding the training.

2. Destination countries with large numbers of unemployed migrant workers could cooperate with companies in the country of origin in providing employment opportunities for the returning workers.

3. Migrant recruiting companies should be encouraged to invest and participate in community-based programmes in countries of origin.

4. Destination countries could increase awareness of the members of the diaspora as potential investors in their country of origin, for example, with the help of Government grants or credits (risk capital).

5. The 2012 Forum could take forward the issue of including the private sector as a dialogue partner on migration and development issues.

**Working session 1.2: Lowering the costs of migration for higher development gains**

*Co-Chairs*: Ambassador Martin Uhomoibhi, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Nigeria; and Alex Zalami, Adviser to the Minister of Labour, United Arab Emirates

*Rapporteur*: Irena Omelaniuk, Senior Adviser to the Forum Chair-in-Office

105. This session addressed an issue pivotal in the Forum debate since its inauguration in 2007, namely, the fact that high social, economic and other costs of migration can reduce the potential developmental benefits of migration, particularly lower-skilled labour mobility. Its work represented the culmination of discussions at three thematic meetings in Asia and Africa[p] and related work throughout the year conducted by the ad hoc Working Group on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development.[q]

106. The session was guided by four questions, relating to: (a) the common factors of good practice for lowering the costs of migration, (b) the role of private sector

[p] The thematic meetings were entitled "Recruitment of workers for overseas employment", Dubai, 18 and 19 January 2011; "Lowering migration costs in collaboration with, and developing a model bilateral framework with, receiving countries", Dhaka, 3 and 4 October 2011; and "From evidence to action: facilitating regional regular labour migration for development", Abuja, 17 and 18 October 2011.

[q] See the Working Group's workplan for 2011 and studies undertaken on low-cost loans, labour recruitment, social protection of temporary migrant workers and household effects of temporary overseas work. Available from www.gfmd.org/en/adhoc-wg/protecting-and-empowering.html.

intermediaries in protecting mobile labour forces, (c) how Governments and the private sector can work together to better match jobs and skills and (d) whether South-North and North-North migration patterns might apply to South-South situations.

*Issues and observations*

107. Participants agreed that lowering the social, economic and other costs of migration is in the common interest of public and private sectors across countries of origin and destination. How to achieve lower costs, given the vastly divergent capacities, motivations and incentives of all players, was a challenge for policymakers, the business sector and migrants alike. A first step was to identify the following key points in the migration cycle across countries where costs can be high and strategic actions by Governments and their partners in origin and destination countries could make a difference:

(a) *Access to information*. For migrants, as ignorance can be expensive, access to information before departure and after arrival on, inter alia, the conditions and remuneration of the job, the contract, living conditions, rights and entitlements, risks and costs, was essential for lowering costs. Recruitment agencies should not have a monopoly on information. The Philippines and Sri Lanka prepare their émigrés extensively before departure; Mexico, Morocco and the Philippines follow up with consular and welfare support in the country of destination. Destination countries like Australia and Canada provide pre-departure orientation and information. The EU Immigration Portal offers online information for people seeking work in EU, while EU-supported Migration and Mobility Resource Centres cater to those without online access;

(b) *Lack of contract transparency*. Contract substitution or alteration, or failure by employers to comply with the terms of agreed work contracts, reduces mobile workers' earning capacities. The United Arab Emirates is testing a contract validation scheme in Asia through the electronic transfer of agreed contracts between country of origin and country of destination;

(c) *Processing costs*, including for passports, medical check-ups, visas, work permits and transportation. Some of the most effective bilateral programmes place the onus of these costs on the employer; but Governments could also negotiate reduced travel costs with transport carriers;

(d) *Migrant loans*, needed to help cover the opportunity costs of migration for work, since high repayment fees can reduce migrants' capacities to save, remit and invest. Low-cost loans were one of the strategies being explored in the Asian context by the ad hoc Working Group on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development;

(e) *Illegal or high recruitment fees*. High fees can create debt bondage which curtails savings, remittances and investments, and encourages overstaying and irregular migration practices. The Philippines stipulates a maximum fee by law, and combines this with a punishment-reward system for registered recruiters. United Arab Emirates law forbids recruitment fees levied on migrants by United Arab Emirates-based recruiters. Some kind of public rating or awards system could be an effective means of ensuring certain compliance across borders;

(f) *Ineffective job-matching*. Mismatches between skills and jobs can lead to brain waste, lower earning capacities, high costs to employers, and possibly irregular migration status. Skills training aligned to real job needs (in both the origin and destination countries) was a way of both protecting migrants and empowering them. This was also a problem for migrants returning home with skills not recognized or accepted for work in the country of origin. On-the-job training in the destination country could be complemented by investment in skills recognition and job opportunity schemes. Responsibility for this can be shared by Governments and the private sector.

108. Good practices existed in each of these areas, but differed widely with the geopolitical situation, developmental stage, available resources and capacities of the country, particularly between the South and North. Some Governments pointed out that the good practices of Canada or Australia may not be affordable for lower-income countries, and called for capacity-building to ensure that they could be viable partners in migration management. A number of new approaches existed, which could benefit both South-North and South-South labour mobility, as discussed directly below.

109. EU has commenced a project with the Republic of Moldova aimed at strengthening its national employment agency as a viable partner in managing labour exchange. EU has proposed that its Migration and Mobility Resource Centres could give wider access to the EU Immigration Portal. Sweden's Parliamentary Committee on Circular Migration has taken a broader view of circular migration and recommended relaxing its rules on longer-term residence and reacquisition of citizenship, and supporting the development efforts of diaspora in their home country. To address its acute skills shortage, Germany is introducing a new law to ease the recognition of foreign qualifications. Singapore's new law on labour migration seeks to better inform migrants in their own language, dramatically increase penalties for non-compliant employers, and generally foster improved standards in the private sector.

110. Various aspects of South-South migration were discussed which reflect both positive and negative lessons learned from South-North labour movements. Regularization of migration status is a specific strategy or policy employed in different regional contexts (the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Southern Africa and the Common Southern Market (MERCOSUR)), as in some EU countries, to lower the costs of migration. In the experience of ECOWAS, it has been more expensive for all involved to detain irregular migrants than to regularize their status, especially if they are working and reasonably settled in the host community. Under a bilateral agreement with Zimbabwe, South Africa regularizes the status of irregular Zimbabwean workers employed in the country.

111. A broad discussion on circular migration followed, with some Governments emphasizing how they have benefited from the experiences of bilateral arrangements. Civil society argued that circular migration was not a good practice, because it denied migrants access to services and permanent residence in the destination country. It was pointed out that there was a need for further discussion of the term "circular migration" or seasonal or temporary migration. Governments counterargued that most people who work abroad do so to resolve immediate economic problems, not to resettle permanently; and that there were measurable development benefits from circular migration for the families, the economies back

home and the host countries. Where such schemes were closely managed between Governments or between Government and employers, and included protections and support for the migrants, this reduced the need, and the costs, of intermediaries. Regional economic integration frameworks may also enable the spontaneous circulation of people and skills; for example, under the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement of Persons, Residence and Establishment, any ECOWAS national working in Nigeria enjoys the right to residence.

112. Key to ensuring circularity was the enduring link to the home country, and the enablement of migrants or diaspora to move freely between countries, by means of multiple re-entry policies or dual/multiple citizenship. A relatively unexplored factor for assuring such spontaneous circularity comprised skills and qualifications — important both for effective job-matching upfront and for effective labour reinsertion or start-up back home, if and when migrants or diaspora returns from abroad. Skills training and skills recognition were flagged as important next steps in the Forum's exploration of how to lower the costs and raise the development gains of migration.

*Outcomes and recommendations*

113. The following outcomes and recommendations emerged from the session:

1. The Forum could in future discuss the issue of migrant skills/qualifications development and training, as well as skills recognition, for purposes of empowering contract workers and increasing their earning power in the country of destination, and their reintegration potential when they return home.

2. The next Forum may move forward more concretely on monitoring and regulating recruitment agencies, to ensure accountability.

3. The Forum should continue to discuss and monitor circular migration and seasonal or temporary migration.

**Working session 1.3: Global care workers at the interface of migration and development**

*Co-Chairs*: Ms. Mary Mpereh, Principal Planning Analyst for the National Development Planning Commission, Ghana; and Mr. Easton Williams, Director, Social Policy Planning and Research, Planning Institute of Jamaica, Ministry of Finance and Planning

*Rapporteur*: Irena Omelaniuk, Senior Adviser to the Forum Chair-in-Office

114. This working session addressed the specific case study of migrant domestic workers at the interface of migration and development, which had been discussed in two global thematic meetings, in Jamaica and Ghana.[r] The case study illustrated all of the major challenges of labour mobility today within a specific sector affecting many lower-income countries, and with the added dimensions of gender and family. This followed recommendations at the Forum 2010 meeting in Puerto Vallarta to

[r] The thematic meetings were entitled: "Migrant domestic workers at the interface of migration and development: action to expand good practices", Kingston, 7 and 8 September 2011; and "International migrant domestic care workers at the interface of migration and development: action to expand good practice", Accra, 21 and 22 September 2011.

continue the focus on gender and on global care workers; and supported the intentions and principles of the new ILO Convention No. 189.[8]

115. The discussion was guided by three questions: (a) the implications of the global care industry, especially global domestic work, for development; (b) what gender-responsive legal, social and financial protection measures and services can be showcased for replication; and (c) the data and tools needed for effective evidence-based policies and programmes on migrant domestic workers.

*Issues and observations*

116. Participants generally confirmed that care workers contributed positively to the socio-economic development of their families and countries of origin and destination, but that there were also major negative effects. Policymakers needed to be aware of the implications in order to advocate with politicians for more appropriate policy and programme responses.

117. Among the positive effects, domestic workers send home sizeable remittances, which are used in human capital formation. In South-East Asia, women tended to send home a larger portion of their salaries than do men. As regards Jamaica and the Philippines, domestic workers contribute to the health, education and well-being of their families and to national development outcomes. The highly regulated Live-in Caregiver programme in Canada has contributed to a higher level of education in the Philippines. Among the negative effects are the vulnerability of many women to abuse and exploitation in a sector not recognized in most labour laws, and the situation of families left behind. In the Philippines, Ghana and other countries, children of domestic workers abroad experience higher education opportunities, but many also suffer "care drain" in the absence of their mothers. In lower-income countries already facing the multiple challenges presented by refugees and displaced persons, undocumented domestic workers can place an additional strain on the development efforts of the host country (for example, in Djibouti in the 1970s).

118. Regularization is one response to this, but the incentives to be regularized can be too low for those who have left their home country without proper documentation, often to escape hopeless economic circumstances and avoid expensive or inefficient processes in the countries of origin.

119. The effects of this combination of factors are felt particularly severely in South-South corridors, where the solutions lie as much with the development efforts in the country of origin as with the migration policy responses at destination. It was suggested that, in some lower-income countries, development aid might be able to bridge the divide between action and inaction due to economic and other constraints.

120. Participants agreed that regular migration opportunities offered the best forms of social protection, particularly if combined with low pre-departure costs, pre-departure information, regulation of recruitment agencies and enforcement in the workplace. The elements of protection at critical points in the migration cycle are the same as those for all mobile workers, ranging across: education and information for

[8] ILO Convention No. 189 concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers was adopted at the 100th Session of the International Labour Conference, on 16 June 2011. The text of the Convention is available from http://www.ilo.org/ilc/ILCSessions/100thSession/reports/provisional-records/WCMS_157836.

care workers in the country of origin and destination; education of employers and associated recruitment agencies; welfare support for families at home, counselling and adequate consular support for migrants abroad; monitoring of working conditions; financial literacy campaigns; family reunification; portability of social benefits; and reintegration support upon return. Underpinning all these efforts has been the urgent need to bring domestic work under the protection of labour laws and for gender-sensitive policies in country both of origin and of destination, in line with ILO Convention No. 189.

121. Governments agreed that countries of origin, transit and destination can work individually and jointly to ensure more regular, protected movement of domestic workers. The Philippines has abolished recruitment fees and negotiates fair wages with employers for its émigré domestic workers; and deploys welfare officers abroad to support the workers, and family counsellors to regularly visit the families back home. The well-regulated universal visa system of Canada offers incentives to domestic workers (live-in caregivers) to become permanent residents after a period of time in that country and, through its skills requirements (of at least a secondary diploma and formal training in domestic work), has helped foster the growth of training schools in the Philippines. India's overseas workers receive some social security coverage, including health insurance and resettlement packages when they return. In South Africa, domestic workers are included in the labour legislation, and employers must register their employees for unemployment insurance. Spain has just approved new legislation designed to protect the rights of domestic workers and ensure access to the minimum wage.

122. However, it was also recognized that despite well-intentioned policies and laws, the situation on the ground is often quite different, in large part because of the difficulty of enforcement, both within and across borders. For example, in many countries, labour inspections are too expensive and cannot reach all households. Participants agreed that all Governments should consider requiring employers to provide mobile phones for their domestic workers so as to enable them to call a helpline (like the one provided, for example, by India), their embassy or others, in case of emergency. These could also assist with crisis responses.

123. Participants agreed that a major reason for the neglect of domestic work by migration-and-development policymakers was the chronic absence of data on migration flows, stocks and remittances, disaggregated by sex or sector. The Philippines is one of the few countries that collects data on caregivers abroad, and uses the data in tripartite consultations and policymaking back home. Models and methodologies for collecting and sharing data are available from expert organizations and groups such as ILO, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank and UN-Women,[t] but are often not well known or used.

124. Within and between Governments, data collected by one ministry frequently do not match, or link to, data from other ministries, which can have serious consequences in times of crisis. The Philippines has a rapid-response team and crisis desks available, and deploys welfare officers and labour attachés to facilitate quick

[t] See the 2009 report entitled, *Migrants Count Five Steps Toward Better Migration Data* (Washington, D.C., Centre for Global Development, 2009), of the Commission on International Migration Data for Development Research and Policy, earlier reported on in the Forum discussions on data, research and policy coherence, and promoted by the Global Migration Group.

evacuations. Data on Filipino workers abroad are critical for the Government's security and crisis management, and it has been suggested that, in the context of the ad hoc Working Group on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development (co-chaired by the Philippines), such data be included in future Migration Profiles.

125. Some international organizations called for immigration data to be collected through labour-market databases (such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) surveys); and for labour surveys to include modules on migration. However, linking labour-market and immigration databases could also have negative consequences for the migrants, if the data were used for purposes of immigration enforcement. Some new projects have commenced, for example, in Cameroon with EU support, and in India with UN-Women support, to collect data and to secure an understanding of the impacts of domestic work abroad. These projects needed to be followed up for provision of potential lessons for the Forum. It was felt that Governments should explore concrete ways of linking data on labour-market needs with recruitment practices, while also giving regard to data protection issues.

126. As a further information tool for policymakers, UN-Women had prepared a checklist of policy and legal elements to be utilized in drawing up new laws and policies designed to protect and support migrant domestic workers, in line with ILO Convention No. 189. This had been discussed by participants at the thematic meetings held in Jamaica and Ghana and posted on the Forum website (www.gfmd.org). The working session Co-Chairs reported that Ghana and Jamaica had already commenced using the checklist for their policymaking.

*Outcomes and recommendations*

127. The following outcomes and recommendations emerged from the working session:

1. Gender and family should continue to be a focus of the Forum, particularly through ongoing global discussions on domestic workers (expanding on the two workshops held in 2011).

2. The checklist to protect and support migrant domestic workers tabled at the thematic meetings and the concluding debate can be further discussed via an interactive Forum website, as a policy tool for Governments that are developing new laws and policies, or revising old ones, designed to protect domestic workers.

3. The Forum should follow up on the implementation of the report *Migrants Count* promoted by the Global Migration Group; and on the outcomes of efforts in Cameroon and India to collect data, and understand the impacts of domestic work, on development. It should further explore the recommendation of the thematic meetings to include domestic workers (and gender issues generally) in Migration Profiles.

4. Governments need to share knowledge and experiences on gender-responsive legal, social and financial protection measures for migrants through bilateral/multilateral dialogue and other platforms, since these forms of protections are new for some countries.

## B. Cluster II: Addressing irregular migration through coherent migration-and-development strategies

*Co-chairs*: Juan José Garcia, Deputy Foreign Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, El Salvador; and Ambassador Sakir Fakili, Director General for Consular Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey

*Rapporteur*: David DiGiovanna, Deputy Counsellor, Refugee and Migrants Affairs, United States Mission to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva

*Coordinator*: Rolph Jenny, Principal Adviser to the Chair-in-Office

128. The working session sought to broaden the Forum dialogue on irregular migration and development[u] and to share ideas and national and international practices devised to address the development-related causes and impacts of irregular migration in ways that can promote human development. The working session had been prepared on the basis of two thematic meetings, namely, a workshop held in San Salvador on 4 and 5 October 2011, on "Cooperation strategies among States to address irregular migration: shared responsibility to promote human development", and a workshop held in Istanbul on 13 and 14 October 2011, on "Addressing irregular migration through coherent migration and development strategies". The combined results of these meetings were reflected in a cluster summary[v] which served as the basis for the working session discussions.

129. The session addressed the relationship between irregular migration and development and how the two issues connect for purposes of identifying appropriate policy responses to irregular migration, including viable alternatives to it. The session discussed the causes and impacts of irregular migration and how countries of origin, transit and destination can take joint action to deal with those causes; and exchanged information on national, bilateral, regional and international practices designed to protect migrants in an irregular situation. The session also considered the basic elements of success in ensuring that national policies for enforcement of migration laws, prevention of irregular migration and protection of the rights and dignity of migrants can be mutually reinforcing.

*Issues and observations*

130. In opening the debate, the Co-Chairs referred to the key outcomes of the two thematic meetings highlighting, inter alia, that irregular migration, like regular migration, is, in most instances, an adaptation strategy for migrants who are seeking to improve their living and economic conditions. Regular migration and irregular migration share common drivers, but irregular movements are more often caused by a demand for cheap labour and inadequate access to regular employment, including

[u] The 2010 Forum meeting in Puerto Vallarta had addressed certain aspects of this issue, recommending, inter alia, that the topic remain in the Forum agenda. An earlier round table, at the 2008 Forum meeting, in Manila, had dealt with the issue of the empowerment and human rights of migrants with irregular status.

[v] For further background details on the themes of this working session, please refer to the cluster II summary report, prepared in consultation with a government team comprising Australia, El Salvador, Indonesia, Mexico, the Philippines, Turkey, Switzerland and the United States of America. Available from http://www.gfmd.org/en/documents-library/switzerland-2011.html.

in countries of origin, and are often facilitated by smuggling and trafficking networks.

131. While irregular migrants also contribute to the development of their country of origin through remittances and in other ways, reduced mobility, lower salaries and lack of access to health care and education limit their ability to contribute to development. A person's migration status can change from regular to irregular, but a migrant cannot be or become "irregular". Migrants can fall in and out of an irregular status at different stages of the migratory process, in some cases as an unintended consequence of the attempt by national legislation or measures to regulate migration.

132. Apart from political instability and conflict, factors leading to irregular migration include low levels of economic growth and lack of employment opportunities, as well as lack of established meritocratic bureaucracies and justice systems in source countries. Migrants' erroneous perceptions of employment opportunities abroad also play an important role.

133. Irregular migration has a number of negative consequences and thus contributes to distorted perceptions of migration and migrants themselves, which in turn may cause xenophobia and group enmity with regard to both regular and irregular migrants. In host societies, schemes aimed at eliminating such negative attitudes towards migrants should be put in place, regardless of the migrants' status. Governments of destination countries have primary responsibility for protecting the fundamental rights and entitlements of all persons on their soil, while Governments of origin countries should also maintain responsibility for the welfare of their nationals abroad. Consular networks should be strengthened to provide effective support to migrants and protect their rights; and countries of origin should also be supported in actions aimed at discouraging irregular migration.

134. The importance of small and medium-sized enterprises for the economic development of origin countries was highlighted by a Co-Chair, who stated that the creation of such enterprises can reduce the prevalence of the "economic push factors" of irregular migration. He cited a practice in his country, whereby migrant remittances were channelled into the creation of small and medium-sized enterprises, capacity-building and entrepreneurship support, and project assistance and consulting services, through a public institution, the Small and Medium Enterprises Development Organization.

135. Finally, while the issue of the link between irregular migration and development features high in the global agenda, the cause-effect relationship between these two phenomena remains controversial and complex. To ensure more policy coherence and the development of appropriate and common policy responses, it is essential for Governments and other actors to better understand the multiple connections between irregular migration and development.

136. The representative of the European Commission referred to the EU Global Approach to Migration and Mobility, adopted in November 2011, which, building on six years of experience, is intended to become the overarching framework of the EU External Migration Policy, based on partnership with source countries. The four target areas of the Global Approach are: legal migration and mobility, irregular

migration and trafficking in human beings, international protection and asylum policy, and maximizing the development impact of migration and mobility.[w]

137. In the ensuing discussion, many delegates echoed the points made by the Co-Chairs and the European Commission delegate. Others referred to the fact that, over time, their countries had become destination, origin and transit countries of irregular migration simultaneously, a situation that requires new and more coherent policy responses, based on a better understanding of the phenomenon and more effective and common actions by all involved. Some delegates stated the importance of South-South irregular migration, stressing that irregular movements are not just from the South to the North. South-South flows often go to neighbouring countries because of political instability, environmental factors and lack of employment. Such countries suffering from large migration flows should be supported through regional initiatives to promote growth, encourage protection-related response strategies, and provide employment opportunities in host communities; and such support should be provided also as an act of solidarity.

138. Others reaffirmed that political instability and lack of economic opportunities are the principal drivers of irregular migration, but that the demand for illegal and cheap labour in destination countries and existing migrant networks should also be recognized as key factors, in many instances compounded by the activities of smuggler and criminal trafficking networks which advertise false opportunities and ruthlessly exploit the vulnerability of irregular migrant women and men. A delegate referred to a non-binding cooperation framework in the context of the Bali process to reduce irregular movement in the region by undermining criminal networks and ensuring that asylum-seekers have access to asylum procedures.

139. Still, other delegates pointed to the importance of policy coherence when addressing irregular migration. The lack of coherence between migration policies, entry and residence requirements and labour-market realities may contribute to an increase in irregular migration. Further, visa regimes should not lead to policy incoherence and be used as barriers or walls.

140. Some delegates urged destination countries to make available more regular migration opportunities, which may include cooperative approaches to increasing opportunities for regular migration through joint efforts to improve migrant skills and programmes and promote the recognition of professional credentials. Other delegates called for expanded regularization strategies to help increase the development-related contributions of migrants.

141. Still others referred to the need to deal proactively with the pre-migratory stage through targeted information campaigns designed to discourage potential irregular migrants and help migrant communities preserve their "sense of roots" in the home community. Such actions should also be supported through enhanced cooperation with destination countries.

142. Other delegates mentioned the need for comprehensive return and reintegration programmes to be established between origin and destination countries, based on more effective cooperation on establishing the status and identity of irregular migrants, implementing readmission agreements and offering

[w] The full statement is available on the Forum website (http://www.gfmd.org).

more sustainable reintegration support. Some delegates referred to successful cooperation in this respect.

143. Some delegates reaffirmed that as long as there is demand for irregular migration, the phenomenon will persist, since irregular migrants often take jobs that no one else wants. Irregular migrants should also be seen as agents who can contribute to the social and economic development of countries of both origin and destination, for example, through remittances and skills acquisition. However, this should not mean that irregular migration is a "necessary evil", since the costs fall disproportionately on the migrants themselves, and their contribution to development is hampered by their irregular situation and related vulnerability.

144. With regard to assuring basic rights for and protection of irregular migrants, many delegates recognized that respecting such rights can be reconciled with necessary prevention and enforcement measures. Efforts to strengthen enforcement or improve border management should not be viewed as "anti-migrant". Citizens of destination countries demand appropriate enforcement and protection of borders, but prevention, enforcement and protection all need to be managed with respect for fundamental human rights. Such mutually reinforcing actions should be pursued.

145. One delegate urged participants to change the perception of irregular migration as a purely negative phenomenon. Some delegates called for increased attention to the issue of brain drain, including in the context of irregular migration. Others, however, including delegations from traditional countries of origin, noted that brain drain can, in certain circumstances, lead to "brain gain" and enhance human development, if, for example, remittances and other contributions from diaspora communities help to improve educational opportunities in the migrants' communities of origin.

*Outcomes and recommendations*

146. The following outcomes and recommendations emerged from the working session:

1. A more in-depth and common understanding of the concrete linkages between irregular migration and development needs to be created, since these linkages have been inadequately explored and need further examination. Forum members need to clarify what is meant by "development" in the context of irregular migration. The term has multiple meanings which encompass economic, social and political factors, many of which have different interlinkages with regular and irregular migration. Forum member States need to define more clearly which relationships they want to explore at any one time.

2. While it is recognized that irregular migrants, too, contribute to development, of both their countries of origin and their countries of destination (for example, through remittances and skills development), the costs of irregular migration fall disproportionally on the migrants themselves, owing to their increased vulnerability. It is therefore essential for all countries to pursue common efforts to discourage and reduce irregular migration.

3. In addressing the challenge of irregular migration, States need to remember that migrants are human beings with human rights who should be treated with dignity and respect throughout the migration cycle, regardless of their migration status. In this regard, Governments of destination countries should put into place schemes designed to prevent xenophobia and group enmity towards

migrants. The mixed character of many irregular movements, which may include persons in need of international protection, should also be acknowledged.

4. Practical and results-oriented partnerships, shared responsibility, enhanced policy coherence and mutual cooperation between countries of origin and of destination are the key foundations for addressing the multiple aspects of irregular migration and its linkages with development. Any debate on irregular migration should also include the views of transit countries, and visa policies should be reviewed with a view to facilitating regular migration.

5. The Forum should further examine the phenomenon of South-South irregular migration, noting the importance of regional challenges and approaches to the specific regional dynamics of irregular migration and development. Countries suffering from large migration flows should be supported through regional initiatives aimed at promoting growth and providing employment opportunities in host communities, with such support also representing an act of solidarity.

6. Considering that there is less of a propensity to migrate from countries with well-established small and medium-sized enterprises, international cooperation aimed at developing those enterprises in origin countries could be an effective tool in addressing irregular movements. To this end, development aid and technical cooperation between Governments could focus on the creation of small and medium-sized enterprises.

7. Joint public information campaigns to alert potential migrants to the risks inherent in irregular movement need to be enhanced through cooperation between migration authorities in origin and in destination countries. Consular office networks for identifying and assisting migrants in vulnerable situations should be strengthened, and sustainable reintegration programmes and related inter-State cooperation to help re-establish returnees in their home communities and prevent "re-migration" should be pursued.

8. Enforcement and migrant protection objectives can be mutually reinforcing when prevention and enforcement measures are managed in full respect of fundamental human rights. Such mutually reinforcing actions should be pursued.

9. Finally, all delegations expressed strong support for the continued inclusion of the issue of irregular migration and development in future Forum meetings.

## C. Cluster III: Tools for evidence-based migration and development policies

*Cluster Rapporteur*: Mr. Kaçim Kellal, Head, Department of International Affairs and Solidarity Development, Ministry of the Interior, France

*Coordinator*: Rolph Jenny, Principal Adviser to the Chair-in-Office

147. Forum meetings in 2009 and 2010 had sharpened the focus on tools for evidence-based and coherent migration and development policies, inter alia, through discussions of the issues of mainstreaming of migration into development planning, Migration Profiles/Extended Migration Profiles and Policy Impact Assessments. The ad hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research had consistently promoted these concepts and their practical use by Governments and other actors. In

2011, cluster III of the thematic work programme sought to narrow the debate on the three interlinked tools aimed at factoring migration into development planning and assessing the impact of migration and development policies. Related concepts and practices, as well as the synergetic use of the three tools, were explored in an integrated approach.

148. The two working sessions at the 2011 Forum concluding debate dealing with these three topics benefited from seven preparatory workshops, held in Marseille, New York, Batumi/Georgia, Taroudant/Morocco, Chişinău, Abuja and Manila, which had engaged Governments, international organizations and civil society.

**Working session III.1/3: Mainstreaming migration into development planning/ Migration Profiles[x]**

*Co-Chairs*: Esteban Conejos, Jr., Undersecretary, Migrant Workers' Affairs, Department of Foreign Affairs, Philippines; and Daniela Morari, Deputy Head of Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Moldova

*Rapporteur*: Rolph Jenny

149. The discussion in this combined working session on mainstreaming migration into development planning and Migration Profiles was informed by the outcomes of five thematic meetings.[y] The combined results of these workshops were reflected in a cluster summary[z] that laid the groundwork for the working session discussions.

150. The working session sought to deepen the understanding of mainstreaming migration into development planning and to discuss current Government plans and practices in implementing this planning tool. It simultaneously addressed the issue of Migration Profiles and Extended Migration Profiles, including concrete experiences and challenges, and examined the synergetic use of Migration Profiles and migration and development mainstreaming aimed at factoring migration into development planning, and vice versa.

*Issues and observations*

151. In opening the debate, the Co-Chairs explained the concepts underlying the two planning tools. Migration Profiles are frameworks for aggregating, in a structured and systematic manner, existing data and information from national, regional and international sources. They serve to guide, support and monitor informed and coherent policy planning, and require national ownership and appropriate capacity. First introduced by the European Commission in 2005 as a static tool for

[x] Policy Impact Assessments are addressed below the discussion in the section entitled "Working session II".

[y] Workshops held: in New York on 30 June 2011 on "Implementing Migration Profiles"; in Batumi on 12 and 13 July 2011 on "Migration profiles: lessons learned"; in Manila on 20 and 21 October 2011 on "Migration profiles as a tool for informed policymaking, integration and reintegration and emergency response"; in Chişinău held on 12 and 13 October 2011 on "Mainstreaming migration into strategic development planning"; and in Abuja on 17 and 18 October 2011 on "From evidence to action-facilitating regional regular labor migration for development".

[z] For further background details on the themes of this working session, please refer to the cluster III summary report, prepared in consultation with a Government team comprising Argentina, Belgium, France, Georgia, Ghana, Morocco, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova and Switzerland. Available from http://www.gfmd.org/en/documents-library/switzerland-2011/ thematic-meetings.

migration-related data collection, the Migration Profile concept subsequently evolved into that of Extended Migration Profiles which gather information on all developmental, economic, demographic, social and other factors, including human and sustainable development, that impact on migration, and vice versa.

152. Mainstreaming migration into development planning is a process that integrates migration factors in a comprehensive manner into the design of national development plans and related sectoral policies, including implementation, monitoring and evaluation of such actions. Mainstreaming seeks to embed migration in the broader development planning and strategies of countries and also aims to foster policy and institutional coherence on migration and development. The Co-Chairs also referred to the related Global Migration Group pilot projects currently being implemented in Bangladesh, Jamaica, Mali and the Republic of Moldova, and to other experiences such as those of Morocco.

153. Stressing that the Forum has consistently dealt with the need for accurate and timely data, the Co-Chairs reaffirmed the usefulness of Extended Migration Profiles as comprehensive national processes that require intragovernmental coordination among all concerned Government ministries and agencies, and also demand regular updating. Such profiles, which should incorporate all relevant data related to migration and development, entail ongoing processes that demand appropriate national capacity, which may be supported by international technical assistance. National ownership of Migration Profiles is essential. National priorities figuring in a Migration Profile versus the need for international comparability of collected data is another key factor, and Extended Migration Profiles are also seen as key tools for supporting migration and development mainstreaming processes and Policy Impact Assessments.

154. In the ensuing discussion, many delegates expressed their agreement with the points made by the Co-Chairs, stressing in particular the need for Extended Migration Profiles to include timely, comprehensive and regularly updated information. Referring to the issue of reliability of data and related sources, some delegates mentioned the difficulties associated with ensuring that all concerned Government agencies contribute reliable data, agreeing that this requires constant efforts, including effective cooperation, coordinating and sharing mechanisms, and the recognized leadership of one Government agency. Internal coordination can be assured through national focal points or technical working groups, and the effective functioning of such arrangements is also highly dependent on trust among the relevant Government bodies. Collective provision of data by the agencies managing the employment of workers abroad and dealing with welfare-related assistance, and ministries of foreign affairs, embassies, consulates and immigration authorities, was mentioned as an example of good practice.

155. Data should also be shared among Governments, in particular between origin and destination countries. Practices differ in this regard, since some countries are prepared to share data, while others are more reluctant to do so. A delegate from a destination country stated that his Government was sharing data with concerned countries of origin with a view to completing its own information requirements, but regretted that data from these source countries were not always forthcoming. Other delegates stressed the need to develop and share Migration Profile data at the subregional, regional and global levels. A central location for making accessible and sharing such information, for example, a central data bank on the Forum website, would be useful. Others emphasized the usefulness of sharing information on

irregular migrants, and on migrants that, finding themselves caught in situations of conflict, need emergency assistance.

156. Many delegates referred to the issue of Government ownership of Migration Profiles, underlining that such ownership depends first and foremost on the political will of Governments to set in place appropriate structures for implementing and monitoring Migration Profiles. While there was a recognition of the usefulness of technical assistance provided by relevant international organizations, including for capacity-building, it was affirmed that lead responsibility and ownership must be with Governments, which can also be ensured through national focal points and working groups. Such working groups can also include non-governmental actors, namely, researchers, migrant associations and other local actors, thus ensuring larger ownership of the process and complementary perspectives.

157. The issue of comparability of data and of national versus international data was mentioned by a number of delegates, who agreed that such comparability at the regional and international levels is necessary. Templates of Migration Profiles should thus include a common set of core indicators and apply international standards and definitions, such as those developed by the Global Migration Group. However, Governments determine, on their own, the national priority areas to be included.

158. With regard to Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning, delegates recognized the advantage of discussing this planning tool in conjunction with the debate on Migration Profiles. The two instruments should be seen as mutually reinforcing tools through which Governments may factor migration into development planning, including sectoral policies in key areas impacted by migration, and implement more coherent migration and development policies. A few delegates referred to the sectors that link migration with development, such as, inter alia, demographic forecasts; migration in- and outflows; employment; labour-market planning; human capital formation and skills development; brain drain and brain waste; social protection; diasporas; human rights and migrant protection; health services; particular needs of women and children; economic growth; leveraging remittances for local investment and development; and environmental factors.

159. Reaffirming the development potential generated by migration for countries and migrants alike, a number of delegates also acknowledged the usefulness of the mainstreaming tool as entailing a process that requires institutional coherence and cooperation within Government and with civil society and other stakeholders.

160. Others remarked that Governments are at different levels of understanding in respect of this recent planning tool and suggested continued awareness-raising and information-sharing through the Forum, the Global Migration Group and other forums and institutions. Still others referred to the 2010 Global Migration Group publication entitled *Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning: A Handbook for Policy-makers and Practitioners*,[aa] stressing that the *Handbook* should be used for such broader dissemination of the mainstreaming concept.

161. Participants were briefed on the concept and objectives of the Global Migration Group mainstreaming pilot projects implemented by the Governments of Bangladesh, Jamaica, Mali and the Republic of Moldova. Implementing partner

[aa] United Nations publication, Sales No. E.10.III.B.32.

agencies and concerned delegates offered to keep the Forum informed on progress made and, in due time, to share the concrete results of the projects.

162. Some participants also suggested exploring the usefulness of implementing mainstreaming processes at the local level, where migration impacts more directly on the lives of people.

163. The issue of Government ownership of mainstreaming processes was raised by some delegates who reaffirmed that, similar to the Migration Profiles, such ownership depends on the political will to engage in a longer-term and sustained process. The process requires the constant involvement and support of all relevant Government agencies, sufficient time for policy planning cycles, appropriate support structures, national working groups and technical capacity, as well as international funding and the involvement of relevant international organizations.

164. Referring to the link between migration and development mainstreaming and Migration Profiles, a number of delegates recognized that the full range of information gathered in a Migration Profile, in particular Extended Migration Profiles, directly supports and feeds into a mainstreaming process. Migration Profiles should ideally be available before a mainstreaming process is launched. The synergetic use of both tools again requires appropriate Government structures and internal coordination.

*Outcomes and recommendations*

165. The following outcomes and recommendations emerged from the working session:

1. Mainstreaming migration into development planning and extended Migration Profiles should be implemented as entailing longer-term processes and planning tools aimed at factoring migration into development planning, and vice versa.

2. To be successful, these processes require strong political will by implementing Governments, need appropriate national capacity, demand sustained coordination and cooperation within Government, including national focal points and technical working groups, and should also involve relevant actors from civil society.

3. Ownership of both planning tools lies with implementing Governments, which determine the national priorities to be considered.

4. The Global Migration Group and other relevant international organizations should continue supporting Governments through provision of technical advice and international funding.

5. The full range of information gathered in Extended Migration Profiles directly supports and feeds into a mainstreaming process, and such Profiles should ideally be available before a mainstreaming process is launched. The practical link between both tools should thus be recognized and their synergetic use should be actively pursued.

6. The Global Migration Group should pursue its effort to make available core indicators for the comprehensive collection of data in Extended Migration

Profiles, inter alia, for the purpose of ensuring appropriate comparability between national and international data.

7. To ensure comprehensive and reliable data in Extended Migration Profiles, all relevant Government agencies should provide data on the basis of all the information that the respective Government agencies have available, and should regularly update such data.

8. Governments should share Migration Profile data with other Governments, in particular between destination and origin countries, so as to incorporate the full range of relevant information. Where applicable, this should include data on irregular migrants and on migrants who find themselves caught in situations of conflict. Migration Profile data should also be shared at the regional and global levels. The creation of a data bank on the Forum website, where such data are made accessible and can be shared, would be welcomed.

9. Recognizing the different levels of knowledge of the mainstreaming migration into development planning tool, the Forum, the Global Migration Group and other relevant bodies should pursue efforts to raise awareness of this tool among Governments and other actors, inter alia, through the publication entitled *Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning: A Handbook for Policy-makers and Practitioners*. Progress and results of the Global Migration Group mainstreaming pilot projects in Bangladesh, Jamaica, Mali and the Republic of Moldova should also be shared in due time with Forum participating Governments.

10. Considering migration's impact at the local and regional levels and the fact that local actions are complementary to national development plans, mainstreaming experiences at local and regional levels should be launched and progress reported to Governments and civil society actors, under the auspices of the Forum's ad hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research.

**Working session III.2: Impact assessments of migration and development policies**

*Co-Chairs*: Mohammed Bernoussi, Secretary-General, Ministry in charge of the Moroccan Community abroad, Morocco; and Michel Mordasini, Director, Global Cooperation, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Switzerland

*Rapporteur*: Beata Godenzi, Head, Global Program Migration and Development, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Swiss Task Force

166. Discussions in this working session were informed by two thematic meetings.[bb] The combined results of the two workshops were reflected in the above-mentioned cluster summary.[cc] The objective of the session was to broaden the understanding of impact assessments of migration and development policies so as to determine their longer-term impact, discuss the benefits of and obstacles to such assessments, and review related concepts and methodologies. Concurrently, the working session also addressed the contribution that migrant associations can bring to development, including related challenges and key factors of success.

[bb] Workshops held: in Marseille on 14 and 15 June 2011 on "Managing migration and development policymaking, assessment and evaluation"; and in Taroudant, Morocco on 19 and 22 September 2011 on "The contribution of migrant associations to development".

[cc] Please refer to footnote z above.

*Issues and observations*

*Impact assessments of migration and development policies*

167. The Co-Chairs opened the debate by underlining the thematic link of this session with the earlier working session on mainstreaming migration into development planning and migration profiles. The three tools — impact assessments, migration and development mainstreaming, and Migration Profiles —

should be regarded as interlinked instruments that can serve Governments as means of factoring migration into national development planning, assessing in due time the concrete impact of related migration and development policies, and ensuring effective coherence among these policies.

168. Impact assessments judge the longer-term impact and merit of a policy or programme, determine to what extent a policy or programme has achieved its stated goals, and seek to identify what works and what does not. The Marseille workshop outcomes had pointed to a number of ideas, issues and conclusions that should be taken further in this session, in particular the notion of promoting a "culture of evaluation"; the required technical assessment capacity of Governments; Government ownership of assessment processes; the expert and financial support of relevant international organizations; and the need to comprehensively assess all developmental, social and political aspects and impacts. Practical experiences should be shared among Governments, and assessments should also rely on the knowledge of regional and local actors, including civil society. There also exist obstacles and fears — the so-called "fear factor" — that may prevent Governments from engaging in assessments. These obstacles need to be addressed openly.

169. Welcoming these introductory remarks, delegates reaffirmed the crucial importance of assessing the longer-term effects of their policies and programmes. "Learning by doing" is a key aspect of good policymaking, and a number of delegates referred to planned or already implemented evaluation exercises in their countries. Observer delegates mentioned impact assessment initiatives carried out with Governments in a cross-regional context, as well as an international survey which showed that only a limited number of Governments are conducting fully fledged assessments.

170. Many delegates mentioned the difficulty of defining assessment benchmarks and indicators. A comprehensive set of indicators should be developed to ensure an evidence-based assessment approach, noting that international expert agencies should continue assisting Governments in this regard. Data available in Migration Profiles could also contribute to determining such indicators. Assessments should cover impacts in destination and origin countries alike, considering the interdependence of processes and realities at both ends of the migration trail and the need to conduct impact assessments that address both the transnational and national realities of migration.

171. Other delegates stressed the need to integrate assessments upfront in the design of policies and programmes, including the financial cost, and reaffirmed the link of impact assessments with national efforts to factor migration into development planning. Still others referred to coordination within Governments to ensure that all relevant sectors and related impacts are examined, which is often hampered by lack of national capacity. Follow-up to impact assessment outcomes is also critical.

172. The issue of obstacles to implementing impact assessments — in particular the often significant cost implications, the lack of technical expertise and the complexity of dealing with the cross-sectoral aspects of migration and development — was raised by a number of participants. Also, Governments may not be prepared to accept potentially negative results of a determined policy or programme. Impact assessments are long-term processes, whereas Governments are often pressed to rapidly demonstrate the efficient use of resources but not necessarily the longer-term benefits and effectiveness of policies and programmes. Conflictive policy interests that could be made visible through impact assessments may be another obstacle.

173. While recognizing the complexity and costs of assessment processes, delegates reaffirmed the need to continue promoting a "culture of evaluation" and pursue national efforts to set in place appropriate assessment programmes. For many Governments, this implies enhanced cooperation with international agencies, regional bodies and civil society experts, in order to benefit from their knowledge. Further, for many countries, funding for comprehensive assessment exercises should also be made available from international sources.

*The contribution of migrant associations to development*

174. Mentioning that the contribution of migrant associations and diasporas to development had been addressed in previous Forum meetings, the Co-Chairs underlined that only a limited focus had been placed on assessing the concrete impact of such contributions, initiatives and projects of migrant associations. Also, the conditions under which cooperation between migrant organizations, Governments and other stakeholders can be fostered have not been discussed in detail.

175. A number of delegates reaffirmed that migrants, migrant communities and migrants' families left behind are at the heart of migration and development policies. Harnessing the potential of migrant associations to contribute to local development in migrant origin countries should be seen as a key component of such policies. Migrant associations' roots in local realities, solidarity with the homeland, traditional values and an emotive attachment to the local context are essential factors determining the capacity of such associations to act successfully as agents for development.

176. Other delegates stressed that Governments of both destination and origin countries should actively support the efforts of migrant associations to establish themselves as professional actors, inter alia, to ensure that their development initiatives and projects feed coherently into national poverty reduction and development policies. Delegates also stressed the crucial importance of decentralized activities conducted by migrant associations, which create a favourable environment for action at the local level. However, such locally rooted and decentralized interventions should not be detached from overall development goals and strategies of Governments. Others reiterated the need to promote the technical capacity of migrant associations, mentioning that training courses for this purpose are implemented in their country.

177. Some delegates requested more information on current practices of Governments that cooperate with migrant associations, while others stated their intention to engage more systematically with diaspora organizations so as to benefit from their multiple competencies. Others mentioned the need for appropriate

representation of migrant associations in order to facilitate dialogue and cooperation with local authorities on both sides of the migration trail. Still others stressed the importance of coordinated and coherent policies and actions at the local and national levels, and between origin and destination countries, conducted in a spirit of partnership and trust and based on common interests.

*Outcomes and recommendations*

178. The following outcomes and recommendations emerged from the working session:

(a) Impact assessments:

1. Impact assessments should be considered integral components of coherent and effective migration and development policies. In conjunction with migration and development mainstreaming and Migration Profiles, assessment processes serve to Governments to factor migration into development policies, and vice versa.

2. Considering the limited number of Governments that are conducting fully fledged policy assessments, Governments and other actors should continue promoting a "culture of evaluation". The Forum and its ad hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research should assist in this process by pursuing the discussion on this issue and sharing practices and experiences of Governments and relevant international organizations.

3. Obstacles to assessment processes (inter alia, costs, potentially negative results that call into question established Government policies, tension between short-term and long-term impact and interests, and lack of capacity and data) can be overcome through political will and Government ownership. Assessments should be viewed not as a burden, but rather as an opportunity to learn from experiences and determine what works and what does not.

4. International expert bodies should pursue efforts to cooperate with Governments in capacity-building and sharing of technical knowledge.

5. In response to the difficulty of defining assessment benchmarks and indicators, a comprehensive set of indicators should be developed to ensure an evidence-based assessment approach. International expert agencies should continue assisting Governments in this regard. Data available in Migration Profiles could also contribute to determining such indicators.

6. Considering the interlinkages between international and internal migration processes, and their impact on migration and development in concerned countries, transnational impact assessment exercises should also be encouraged and their results shared.

(b) Contribution of migrant associations to development:

1. Home and host countries should recognize that migrant associations can make multiple contributions to the development of local communities, on account of migrant associations' solidarity with their homeland, knowledge of local realities and needs, long-term commitment and respect of local and traditional values.

2. Given the locally rooted nature of migrant associations' engagement with their home communities, their contribution can be maximized through decentralized

development mechanisms. However, such contributions need to feed coherently into national or regional development plans.

3. Support by central Governments and local authorities at both ends of the migration trail are essential if migrant associations are to act as professional partners, in synergy with official migration and development policies.

# VII. Special sessions

## A. Forum Assessment (phase I)

*Co-Chairs*: Eduard Gnesa, Special Ambassador for International Cooperation in Migration, Switzerland; and Peter Sutherland, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for International Migration and Development

179. In opening the discussion, Mr. Gnesa remarked that this special session was specifically dedicated to the Forum Assessment, rather than the broader "Future of the Forum" discussions in previous years, and solicited the guidance of Governments, with a view to preparing the second phase of the Forum Assessment in 2012. He recalled the agreement reached in 2010 in Puerto Vallarta to assess the Forum through a State-led, transparent and comprehensive process, spearheaded by an Assessment Team comprising of interested Steering Group members.[dd] On that occasion, Governments had also agreed to divide the process into two phases: phase I would examine the way in which the Forum operates as a process, including its structures, the impact and relevance of its outcomes, and its relationship with other stakeholders, while phase II would be dedicated to a strategic and political discussion on possible options for the future of the Forum, based on the results of phase I.

180. The Chair commended the Assessment Team for its accomplishments in leading the first phase of the Forum Assessment, including the 73-page report on phase I of the Assessment. He invited Governments to offer comments on the report, expressing the hope that it could be endorsed at this session. He also referred to the assessment process in phase II, based on the Chair's proposal of a workplan for the Assessment Team in 2012, which should be discussed and endorsed at the session so as to bring the assessment process to a successful conclusion.

181. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for International Migration and Development recalled the circumstances under which the Global Forum had been established, upon the proposal of the then Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, and as a result of the 2006 High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development. After five years of existence, the Forum process is alive and well, as clearly demonstrated by the survey of phase I of the Forum Assessment. However, while the Forum's informality is largely responsible for its success, its informal and voluntary status also accounts for the Forum's limited resources, in terms both of funding and supporting structures.

[dd] The Assessment Team comprises Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, India, Kenya, Mexico, Mauritius, Morocco, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Sweden, Switzerland (Chair in 2011) and the United Arab Emirates.

182. Inasmuch as a more solid funding base is required to ensure the Forum's future, he had proposed a funding system that would provide it with more regular and more predictable financial means. The Special Representative urged Governments to continue working on this matter and to also review it in the second phase of the Assessment; and also commended all Forum Chairs for their generosity in hosting the Forum, stressing that their commitment has been critical for the Forum's success. Referring to the Forum Support Unit's valuable work, he considered that the Forum requires a more robust support structure, another issue to be reviewed when discussing possible options for the Forum's future. Concerning the Global Migration Group, the Special Representative felt that, in its functioning as a group, it has not necessarily met all expectations, but he did recognize the important contribution made by a number of individual members to the Forum. The consolidation of the Forum also requires clarification of civil society's involvement in the process, as well as an innovative approach to cooperation with the private sector. Pursuant to analysis of all those options in 2012, the institutionalization of the Forum should be avoided, as should ideological or political debates. The Forum should remain an informal, practice-related and State-led process.

183. The 2013 High-level Dialogue offers an opportunity to think about the future of international migration and development and to address the related opportunities and challenges in a cooperative manner. The High-level Dialogue is distinct from the Forum but offers an opportunity to strengthen it. In the lead-up to and during the Dialogue, policymakers could seize the occasion to address certain issues that deserve attention through common action, including the situation of stranded migrants, as witnessed recently by the situation in Libya. Is it not time to consider a set of guidelines that would provide protection and assistance to migrants in distress because of conflict or natural disasters and for seeking ratification of ILO Convention No. 189, Concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers, for engaging diasporas more fully in development, and for clearing the way for more effective skills recognition and portability of pensions? The Forum can contribute a wealth of ideas and themes that would feed into the Dialogue. It would thus be advisable that previous and current Chairs of the Forum work together to determine those substantive Forum outcomes that could be brought to the attention of the High-level Dialogue. In concluding, Mr. Sutherland expressed his gratitude to the Chair and welcomed Mauritius as the 2012 Forum Chair.

184. Referring to the work of the Assessment Team in 2011, its Chair, Dominique Paravicini of Switzerland's Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, noted that the Assessment Team had met seven times in 2011, in pursuance of its terms of reference, as endorsed by Governments in Puerto Vallarta in 2010. The Team's mandate included the definition of the elements to be assessed in phase I; the recruitment of an independent assessment expert; the preparation of a cost estimate for the survey; the agreement on the assessment methodology; the analysis of the information collected from 66 Government and 11 observer questionnaires; and the drafting of a comprehensive report on the survey to be submitted to the Friends of the Forum. Mr. Paravicini emphasized that the Assessment Team had fulfilled its mandate. Upon the endorsement of the assessment report by Governments, the first phase of the Forum Assessment exercise would be regarded as having been successfully completed.

185. He then presented the draft workplan for the Assessment Team in 2012, setting out the framework for the strategic and political discussion on possible options for

the future of the Forum to be conducted by the Assessment Team, the Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum in 2012. According to the proposed workplan, shared with the heads of delegation ahead of this session, the Assessment Team would prepare a discussion paper with possible options on the Forum's future, based on the results of the survey, and consult with the Steering Group and Friends of the Forum with a view to soliciting their views. Based on these consultations, the Assessment Team would then develop a consolidated paper on the basis of which the strategic and political debate of the Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum would be pursued. Finally, a summary of these discussions would be prepared for endorsement by the Friends of the Forum at the sixth annual Forum meeting in Mauritius. Mr. Paravicini conveyed the Chair's confidence in the success of this workplan with respect to constructively narrowing down the number of concrete options available to the Forum until the end of 2012.

186. In the ensuing discussion, delegates expressed agreement with the 2011 Assessment report and the proposed workplan for the Assessment Team in 2012, stressing, inter alia, that phase II of the Assessment should make use of the principal findings of the 2011 Assessment report, and that the analysis of possible options for the Forum's future should be based on an open political and strategic discussion, but that the focus should not be limited to the 2011 survey. No further questionnaires were required, as the 2011 survey had provided sufficient technical information to enable Governments to engage in an open and transparent debate on the Forum's future. Some delegates felt that phase I had sometimes lacked transparency and that more transparency was needed in 2012. Next year's focus should be on consensus-building which could be achieved only through open and constructive dialogue. Phase II of the Forum Assessment should be completed by the end of 2012, before the High-level Dialogue in 2013.

187. Other delegates remarked that the inter-State and participatory character of the Forum should be preserved, that phase II should take account of the Forum's evolution during the past five years, that the Forum should cooperate with the United Nations, the Global Migration Group and civil society in a flexible manner and that the thematic focus on development should be strengthened. The concept of development should also be more clearly defined. Some delegates considered that the Forum had not sufficiently focused on the migrants themselves, that no substantial improvements for their conditions had been achieved and that the Forum devoted too much energy to organizational and process-related issues. A number of delegates also stressed the need to promote more practical outcomes capable of enabling countries to strengthen their policies at the national level.

188. Concerning Forum funding, many delegates echoed the Special Representative's remarks on the need to ensure a more solid and predictable financial basis for the Forum, while others stressed the need to clarify the roles of the Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum. Some also considered that arrangements for interaction with civil society should be reviewed, including the Common Space set-up. Still others commended the Special Representative for his critical role in the Forum process, which should continue in the future.

189. Finally, delegates noted with appreciation the announcement of the Government of Turkey that it was considering assumption of the presidency of the Forum in 2015.

190. In closing the special session, Mr. Gnesa provided a summary of the outcomes of the discussion, which included noting that the report on phase I of the Forum Assessment had been endorsed by the heads of delegations, that it would be used as basis for the strategic and political discussion in 2012 on the future of the Forum and that the Assessment Team would continue leading the assessment process in close consultation with the Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum based, on the workplan for the Assessment Team in 2012 and the terms of reference endorsed in Puerto Vallarta in 2010. Finally, he thanked Governments for the fruitful discussion and for reiterating their commitment to guiding the Forum's assessment towards the production of concrete suggestions, with a view to improving the Forum process in the future.

## B. Platform for Partnerships[cc]

*Co-Chairs*: Hans Peter Walch, Head, Migration and Passport Office, Liechtenstein; and Ambassador Usha Dwarka-Canabady, Head, Economic Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mauritius

191. The special session on the Forum's Platform for Partnerships began with a brief review of the year's achievements, followed by progress reports of Platform projects launched at the fourth meeting of the Global Forum in Puerto Vallarta, and closed with a presentation on the salient characteristics of three projects currently featured on the Platform.

192. The Co-Chairs opened the session by providing some background information on the Platform. It was recalled that the concept of the Platform had been put forward by the Government of Switzerland under the 2010 Chair (Mexico) in response to repeated calls from Governments for the establishment of an interactive space where States could exchange ideas, knowledge and best practices and promote partnerships on developing tangible projects among Forum stakeholders, with a view to concretely achieving Forum goals.

193. The importance of information-sharing and information accessibility was further highlighted during the course of the Forum's 2011 concluding debate, notably at the cluster III working session on mainstreaming migration into development planning/Migration Profiles. Calls were made for encouraging Governments to support Platform for Partnerships activities by posting information online and contributing financially.

194. The Co-Chairs sent the following questions to the floor, with a view to guiding the subsequent discussions:

- How can Governments be further encouraged to use the Platform and to actively participate in its development?
- What kind of support is needed to keep the Platform for Partnerships up and running?
- What are the roles of non-governmental actors in the Platform for Partnerships, which is primarily a State-led initiative?

[cc] The special session on the Platform for Partnerships was coordinated by Estrella Lajom, Head of the Forum Support Unit, which administers the Platform.

**Part I: review and highlights of the Platform for Partnerships**

195. Prior to reviewing the year's outcomes and highlights, the Forum Support Unit provided a presentation on the structure and content of the Platform for Partnerships website as well as a snapshot of the wide array of practices currently featured online. Focus was also on the space featuring "calls for action" and the soon-to-be launched migration policy toolkit section, which will provide links to the new Migration Profiles repository and the webpage of the handbook on engaging diaspora in development activities.

196. Since the first working session on the Platform for Partnerships, organized in Puerto Vallarta in November 2010, a number of milestones have been reached. In March 2011, the enhanced (online) Platform was launched. In May 2011, focused group discussions with 24 Steering Group members were convened and resulted in a compilation of 172 concrete practices. The first issue of the Platform newsletter was also produced. As a result of these actions, 13 migration and development practices shared by 11 Governments are currently being showcased on the website and 2 migration-and-development calls for action (training on protection of unaccompanied migrant children and the handbook on engaging diaspora for policymakers in home and host countries) have resulted in tangible projects. A progressive increase in the frequency of visits to the website has also been noted.

197. Over the course of the year, various calls have been made during the thematic meetings for strengthening the use of the Platform for Partnerships tool and promoting better evidence-gathering and knowledge-sharing among countries, international organizations and other stakeholders.

198. In response to the presentation, one delegate enquired why the focused group discussions had been limited to the Steering Group members. The Forum Support Unit underlined the fact that involving the Steering Group members was a strategic choice aimed at providing momentum for the implementation of this new tool and collecting feedback and suggestions from the Steering Group. Another representative put forward the idea of posting videos illustrating the featured projects, as a means of encouraging the participation of more countries.

**Part II: progress reports on Platform for Partnerships projects launched in Puerto Vallarta**

199. Presentations were then made on three Platform for Partnerships projects launched in Puerto Vallarta, highlights of which are provided below.

*Project 1: handbook on engaging diaspora in development activities*

*International Organization for Migration/Migration Policy Institute*

200. The handbook, a joint project of the International Organization for Migration and the Migration Policy Institute funded by the Governments of the Netherlands and Switzerland, is currently being edited and finalized. The handbook was created to serve as a user-friendly, accessible guide on best practices of Governments on diaspora initiatives. The handbook is not merely a compendium of best practices, as it also provides a road map on how Governments can fully engage their diaspora. Information was collected through a two-part survey among Forum member States and supplemented by in-depth interviews with policymakers and practitioners and review of the literature and programme and policy documents.

201. The representative of the Joint Migration and Development Initiative offered a brief presentation on the Initiative handbook which focuses on civil society actions and strategies in the field of migration and development. This handbook — available online in French and English — can be viewed as complementary to the Government-centred handbook developed within the framework of the Platform for Partnerships.

202. In the ensuing discussion, one country representative stated that a special committee for diaspora matters had been set up within the national parliament and was now two years old. Also raised was the issue of appropriate legislative frameworks for diaspora issues and lessons learned to ensure better-informed diaspora policies. A delegate mentioned the possibility of creating an application for smartphones that would increase interactivity and accessibility of the handbook.

203. In response, it was stressed that the handbook was a living document to be updated regularly with fresh examples. In terms of effective legislative tools for encouraging diaspora's involvement, good practices include flexible citizenship laws and economic incentives (special property rights, tax incentives, access to land and portable benefits, among others).

204. One project that was featured prominently in the handbook, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) pilot programme for non-profit projects of migrant associations (2007-2010), was presented by Germany. It was concluded that the handbook was a useful and necessary tool which served not only as a reference book but also as a road map for Governments as they engaged their diaspora for development purposes.

205. Questions on how to encourage Governments to use the handbook were also raised. One country commented in this regard, that formal presentations could be made to Governments so as to ensure its adequate use.

*Project 2: protecting unaccompanied migrant children*

206. The project, an initiative of the Government of Mexico conducted through the National Migration Institute, is designed to better protect unaccompanied minor migrants. It is based on an innovative model of training of child protection officers. To date, 3,500 officials have been trained, not only in Mexico but also in Honduras, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic. While capacity-building at the regional level has been successful, so far no training initiatives have been undertaken, outside of the region, although some countries have expressed their interest informally. For this reason, Mexico decided to showcase the project on the Platform for Partnerships in order to reach countries at the global level.

207. In the subsequent discussion, the issue of the obstacles to a more global outreach of the programme was mentioned. In response, it was underlined that lack of knowledge was impeding international outreach. The Platform for Partnerships thus serves as a critical tool for reaching out to all Forum countries. It was also stressed that the training opportunity offered by Mexico is completely free of charge.

*Project 3: Migration Profiles repository*

208. The Philippines made a brief statement highlighting the fact that Migration Profiles/Extended Migration Profiles are increasingly being recognized as useful

tools for collecting migration and development data. The Philippines hosted a Forum thematic workshop on Migration Profiles in October during which countries emphasized the utility of the Migration Profiles/Extended Migration Profiles as a tool for more linked-up and coherent policymaking. In light of this, the Philippines welcomed the launch of the Migration Profiles repository as a timely initiative.

209. The International Organization for Migration then walked the audience through the online structure and content of the Migration Profile repository, which will be regularly updated to reflect future developments and discussions at the regional and global levels. The repository illustrates clearly the added value of the Platform for Partnerships as a neutral space not only for compiling all the existing Migration Profiles, but also for offering information and guidance tools related to the Migration Profiles/Extended Migration Profiles in general and, more important, the often challenging process of developing Migration Profiles/Extended Migration Profiles. It was also stressed that Governments must retain ownership of the Migration Profiles/Extended Migration Profiles even though international organizations, the civil society and other actors also take part in their conceptualization and implementation.

210. In response to the presentation, one country representative proposed intensifying their partnership with their national International Organization for Migration country office. The European Commission — instrumental in respect of the inception of the Migration Profile concept — reminded the audience that the Migration Profile was a useful tool for prompting dialogue and partnership with other countries. Commenting more broadly on the array of tools presented, another delegate called for their timely translation into French so as to increase accessibility.

**Part III: new migration and development initiatives**

211. The final part of the programme focused on the presentation of some initiatives at the national and regional levels which are currently showcased on the Platform for Partnerships. Japan presented its programme designed to facilitate school education for foreign children, which has been implemented since 2009 by the Ministry of Education, Sports, Science and Technology in partnership with the International Organization for Migration. The objective is to establish classrooms where language and general study lessons in Japanese can be provided to students who have stopped attending school owing to economic difficulties. Since its inception, over 5,000 children have participated in this programme.

212. The European Union then provided the backdrop for the EU Global Approach to Migration and Mobility whose aim is to establish strategic partnerships with various countries. Emphasis was placed on the concept of "mobility" which is broader than that of migration, as it encompasses short-term mobility. The Global Approach was designed to be migrant-centred, as it also addresses issues of protection, asylum and social costs.

213. To showcase migration and development-related practices being conducted in the context of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility, the Czech Republic cited the initiatives of the Prague process which had convened its last ministerial conference in November 2011. The process involves 50 countries in EU as well as others in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and Turkey. It comprises three basic elements: (a) a comprehensive approach that takes into account all

aspects of migration, (b) the idea of partnership on equal footing and (c) a focus on achieving concrete goals.

214. In a final presentation, Spain shared information about the Rabat process which had recently met within the framework of the recent third Euro-African Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development, held in Dakar on 23 November 2011, with 55 countries in attendance. The Rabat process is grounded in the principles of mutual trust and shared responsibility. Spain also offered a brief presentation on the Fund for Migration and Development, currently featured on the Platform for Partnerships. The programme has been running in partnership with 15 ECOWAS countries since 2007. It has been increasingly successful and 24 projects focusing on the fight against human trafficking, and institutional strengthening, have been funded to date.

215. In closing, the incoming Chair (Mauritius) strongly called for Governments to further utilize and contribute to the Platform for Partnerships with a view to fostering exchange and building partnerships. The incoming Chair also provided assurance that the Platform for Partnerships will be utilized as an important tool in helping to implement achieve the 2012 work agenda.

## C. Relationship between the Global Forum and non-governmental partners

*Co-Chairs*: Ambassador Ernesto Céspedes Oropeza, Director-General of Global Issues, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mexico; and Han Peters, Director, Consular Affairs and Migration Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands

216. The special session came to a clear conclusion: the Global Forum on Migration and Development is a State-led process that benefits from the expertise and input of international organizations and civil society (together referred to as non-governmental partners). The issue is not whether but how best to engage these partners, which have been an integral part of the Global Forum since its first meeting in 2007.

217. Following welcoming comments from the Co-Chairs, the participants heard brief presentations by two experts on the history and forms of non-governmental engagement to date. The speakers pointed out that participation of international organizations and civil society in the High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2006 had paved the way for inclusion of these actors in the operating modalities adopted during the first meeting of the Global Forum, held in Brussels in 2007. Since then, the relationship between the governmental process and non-governmental partners has matured and deepened.

218. Notably, the Civil Society Days have expanded and now include two full days of discussion, thereby allowing more in-depth exploration of issues. Moreover, in 2011, the Days were directly organized by the International Catholic Migration Commission, a civil society organization. The Commission, as a member of civil society directly involved in addressing the issue, had been an active participant in previous Civil Society Days.[rr] This organizational change fostered the independence of the Days, made the dialogue between civil society organizations and

[rr] John Bingham, head of policy at ICMC, was designated to report to the Governments during the opening session of the 2010 meeting of the Forum.

Governments easier, and helped improve accountability and coordination mechanisms among civil society organizations themselves. Other notable developments included the incorporation of the People's Global Action on Migration, Development and Human Rights as an active participant in the Days. The People's Global Action is an important actor, since it gathers together about 1,000 representatives of migrant organizations, as well as recognized academics.

219. Another important development in Government-civil society engagement has been the introduction of the Common Space, established in Puerto Vallarta in 2010 and continued in Geneva, with a direct link to one of the thematic priorities of the 2011 meeting of the Forum. The Common Space has allowed interaction among governmental and non-governmental actors to deepen. However, as one speaker clearly mentioned, the engagement goes well beyond the annual meetings of the Forum and includes a range of activities going from the preparation of the sessions to involvement in the Forum ad hoc working groups and thematic meetings or "joint symposia" like the one organized in August in Geneva to follow-up on Forum conclusions and recommendations.

220. The findings of the first stage of the Assessment of the Forum were also discussed, as they pertained to civil society engagement. As no consistency in views on the role of civil society was noted, a range of ways to strengthen the interaction with civil society derived from the Assessment report were presented and further considered in the discussion.

221. One Co-Chair briefly summarized the questions aimed at guiding the ensuing discussion:

- What arrangements have proved effective regarding civil society participation in the Forum?
- What lessons have been learned for the future use? What future modalities for civil society participation could be envisaged?
- How can an effective consultation mechanism between Governments and civil society be set up?
- How can international organizations and civil society be engaged in the High-level Dialogue and future Forum meetings?

222. The discussion on these questions focused on four key concerns: (a) what modalities of engagement are most effective, (b) what is the best timing for engagement with civil society, (c) whether all stakeholders have been included sufficiently and (d) how best to continue the engagement, especially as preparations are made for the 2013 High-level Dialogue.

**Modalities for engagement**

223. The participants identified various ways in which international organizations and civil society contribute to the deliberations of the Global Forum. Participants recognized the contributions of the United Nations and other international and regional organizations, particularly through the involvement of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for International Migration and Development in providing strategic advice, and of the members of the Global Migration Group in providing expert support in the preparation of Forum meetings and the implementation of Forum outcomes and recommendations. Appreciation

was shown to the International Organization for Migration for hosting the Forum Support Unit and offering its assistance in preparation of materials for the discussions. Several Global Migration Group members had also co-organized thematic meetings in the lead-up to the concluding debate in 2011 and participated in the ad hoc Working Group on Data, Research and Policy Coherence, and the ad hoc Working Group on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development. A representative of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat provided a schedule of the lead-up to the High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, expressing his hope for continued cooperation between Governments and international organizations in these preparations.

224. While re-emphasizing the State-led nature of the process, delegates also expressed appreciation for the role of civil society in augmenting and contributing to the discussions of the Forum. Most participants spoke to the importance of the Common Space as an innovation in allowing an examination of issues, with input from both civil society and Government. As one delegate observed, the Common Space is an opportunity for exchange. A number of participants urged further evolution in the Common Space in order to permit more effective dialogue. One delegation emphasized the need to consolidate the framework in which the Common Space is held, emphasizing that the Common Space should provide for frank and open dialogue that went beyond arguments and complaints in order to fulfil expectations in respect of bridging the gap between governments and civil society organizations. The Common Space should be a venue not only for presenting problems but also for discussing possible solutions. Another delegate concurred, highlighting the need to set common objectives for the Common Space. Noting that it is difficult to have true discussions in a setting with more than 700 participants, several delegations expressed a preference for smaller groups within which to discuss topics of common interest at future Forum meetings. One delegate recommended a break-up of the Common Space into smaller parallel discussions within the context of the Forum process and final event as a useful topic for exploration, to be recommended to Mauritius as Chair.

225. Several delegations observed that the Common Space came at the end of the process and made reference to the need for engagement with civil society in the lead-up to the annual Forum meetings. One delegation described the consultations held several times a year with members of civil society for the purpose of discussing the issues in the Forum agenda. Those consultations were held in person and via teleconference. They have been important inputs into the Governments' understanding of the issues and preparations for their participation in the thematic meetings and the concluding debate. Delegations further emphasized the value of conferring with their national civil society representatives during the Civil Society Days in order to gain a better appreciation of the issues discussed and the recommendations to be made to the Forum. The current Chair observed that an increasing number of Governments were taking this opportunity to meet with their civil society representatives, an initiative that was consistent with previous recommendations of the Civil Society Days and with efforts to achieve greater coherence and a global approach to migration. Continuous engagement with civil society builds trust in the relationship, a delegation noted. As described, the aim is not to fuse identities of government and non-governmental actors but to better recognize each other's roles.

226. The thematic meetings in 2011 had increased both civil society and international organization involvement in preparations for the Forum meeting. One delegation noted that these meetings were very productive because partners, issues and themes had been deliberately selected, allowing for real interaction. The ad hoc Working Groups also benefited from feedback from international organizations, civil society and especially academics and other experts who could bring new data, research and methodologies to the attention of Governments as they prepared the agenda for the Forum. Another delegate suggested that side events and the Platform for Partnership discussions could provide useful information on topics other than those under discussion in the working sessions and could be a relevant forum for engagement between governments and non-governmental actors.

227. A representative of an international organization concurred, noting that the thematic meetings were very constructive owing to the joint participation of States, especially policymakers from the capitals, international organizations and non-governmental organizations. As a result, the debate in the working session on cluster III regarding Migration Profiles and mainstreaming had been animated and at once practical, drawing on the conclusions and recommendations of the thematic meetings held under this topic. The discussions were also enhanced by State-international organization collaboration on a Global Migration Group project piloting the mainstreaming of migration into development planning. The practical experiences of the pilot countries animated the discussions at the working session, as did the experiences of countries that, with the assistance of international organizations and other experts, are preparing Migration Profiles. Because of these practical activities, there is greater engagement of Governments in the debate and discussions go beyond generalities.

**Timing of engagement**

228. Many delegations spoke to the need for more sustained engagement between States and non-governmental partners. As discussed previously, several delegations described consultations that they had held with civil society partners in the lead-up to the concluding debate and recommended the practice. Engaging international organizations early in the process was also seen to be essential to the effectiveness of the process. Engaging with these partners early on in efforts to understand the issues and possible actions to be taken will make follow-up to the discussions more effective. Good examples of specific undertakings arising from ideas broached in the Forum that had been implemented by partners were projects on "mainstreaming migration" and the Migration Profiles, as discussed previously.

229. One delegation suggested a different sequencing of the Civil Society Days and Forum meetings to eliminate an overlapping of time frames, recommending that civil society meet well ahead of Governments so that States would have more time to digest the recommendations that came out of the Civil Society Days. Others countered, however, that the current sequencing of the Civil Society Days and the Forum discussions allow for exchange of views, as seen in the Common Space. They expressed concern that separating the two meetings in time would reduce the opportunity for meaningful dialogue. In addition, certain other delegates referred to the need for more interactive sessions between Governments and civil society organizations during the whole year and during the meeting of the Forum itself, bringing up the idea of small interactive sessions on topics in the Forum agenda so as to enhance the quality of dialogue and provide an opportunity for the formulation

of effective and practical partnerships, as had been the case for the Joint Symposia convened in August and October with both Governments and civil society.

**Partners and stakeholders**

230. Delegations agreed on the need for engagement with a broad range of non-governmental partners, including international organizations that had expertise in migration and development issues as well as civil society. The term "civil society" was interpreted as including representatives of migrant and diaspora organizations, trade unions, migrant rights groups, academia and the private sector. While each of these groups has been represented in the Civil Society Days and the Common Space, the discussion focused on identifying ways to increase the participation of two specific groups deemed to have particular importance as stakeholders in decisions on migration and development: the diaspora and the private sector.

231. Several delegations spoke of the need for greater engagement of States with migrants and members of the diaspora within the Forum setting and beyond. One delegation described a series of initiatives aimed at strengthening the role of diaspora, including a handbook on the contribution of the diaspora, assisting Governments in countries of origin in engaging their diaspora in development projects, and supporting the EU Diaspora Outreach Initiative, which is aimed at skills and knowledge transfer. Another participant mentioned that one success of the Civil Society Days had been the growth in the number of migrant-led associations participating in the meetings, to the point where they represented the largest single group. Another participant noted that the involvement of the People's Global Action has been an important innovation as well, since many of its members are migrant-led associations.

232. Less successful has been the engagement of the private sector in the Forum processes in general. This has been the case despite the success of the Bern meeting, the agenda for which had focused specifically on private sector engagement. Fewer representatives of businesses have applied for participation in the Civil Society Days than representatives of the other components of civil society (migrant and diaspora organizations, trade unions, migrant rights organizations, academia and researchers). Participants were reminded of the conclusions of the thematic meeting on "Markets for migration and development", held in Bern in September 2011, namely, that:

> "Successful migration management can only take place on the basis of close collaboration between government and industry. It was agreed that the half-hearted dialogue between public and private sector entities was partly the result of an underdeveloped institutional framework and bureaucratic obstacles. The difficulty of having a coherent strategy to link security, foreign policy and economic policies was seen as an additional obstacle to developing a sustainable migration policy.

Questions had been raised about the capacity and relevance of civil society organizations and, by extension, of the International Catholic Migration Commission, as the international civil society coordinator for the 2011 Forum, with regard to mobilizing the private sector. In relation to this, there was agreement by Government representatives and the International Catholic Migration Commission that other channels should be explored.

**Moving ahead**

233. The State-led nature of the Forum was clearly not in dispute during the special session, nor was the involvement of civil society and international organizations. The question that came up most often is how and when Governments, civil society and international organizations should engage in the Forum and how the Chair should organize the consultation with civil society actors as a whole. The discussions demonstrated the value of gaining inputs from non-governmental partners at each stage of the process, from preparations to the implementation of recommendations coming out of the Forum discussions. A key element of the discussion was the issue of shared responsibility, that is, the responsibility of each partner to engage in meaningful exchange.

234. In sum, the discussion came up with a multiplicity of ways in which Governments could engage effectively with civil society and international organizations in the context of a State-led process. In this regard:

- The Common Space was perceived as a welcome development. It was also recognized, however, that the group is too large to engage in meaningful dialogue. In the interest of finding new ways of making the Common Space more effective, it may be beneficial to break it up into smaller groups engaging more intensively on specific issues and serving as either a complement to or substitute for the Common Space as it operated in Puerto Vallarta and Geneva. The process of the smaller group discussion could be distilled and spread out during the Forum as such and not automatically scheduled for the first day, as an opening session at the Forum. This will depend on how the preparation of the Forum process is organized over the course of the year and how discussions between the Chair and the representative of civil society organizations develop.

- The engagement of civil society and international organizations in the thematic meetings appeared to have been effective even though an evaluation has not yet been done. Such meetings may be a means of engaging multiple actors in discussing specific issues in preparation for the Civil Society Days and the final meeting among States.

- The same can be said of joint meetings organized twice in 2011 in partnership with the International Catholic Migration Commission and the Chair. The Joint Symposium held in August had also actively engaged national non-governmental organizations of Switzerland, whose own institutional development could benefit from the knowledge of the global actors.

- The ad hoc Working Groups also provide an opportunity for more focused discussions among States, civil society and international organizations.

- There was widespread appreciation of the value of holding consultation meetings on the national level between Governments and civil society before the Forum's annual meetings in order to provide input to the government discussions. A further useful opportunity for such bilateral exchanges is provided by meetings held on the margins of the Civil Society Days.

- The Platform for Partnerships and side events have been effective means of obtaining input from different stakeholders during the final meetings of the Forum.

235. In relation to the modalities of collaboration between the Chair and the Global Migration Group, the following conclusions were arrived at: the systematization of a dialogue at the level of the Chair-in-Office and the current Chair of the Global Migration Group and the regular inclusion of a representative of the Forum Chair-in-Office at periodic Global Migration Group working-level meetings for the purpose of exchanging information and updates on ongoing events and processes in relation to Forum preparation had been assessed positively by both parties and, by extension, by those Governments present. However, this consolidated dialogue with the Global Migration Group as a whole did not and should not exclude more focused discussion at bilateral level with specialized agencies. The 2011 meeting of the Forum had witnessed strong commitment of some Global Migration Group agencies to supporting the organization of thematic meetings chaired by Governments.

236. Last but not least, the modalities for engaging with civil society organizations in 2011 have been drastically revamped through engagement in direct partnership with a fellow civil society actor, International Catholic Migration Commission. This option brought added value to the former modalities which had entailed going through a third party, as it facilitated greatly the consultation process within the civil society organizations themselves, between the civil society organizations and the Chair and, by extension, between the civil society organizations and Governments. However, as the resources were fewer than in the previous years, civil society organizations could not implement, as foreseen, their plan of action (entailing organization of civil society organizations preparatory interregional meetings and more systematized participation in Forum thematic meetings). It is therefore too early to assess either the impact of such direct collaborative modalities on the quality of the interaction or the 2011 Chair's reasons for promoting engagement in a direct partnership with a civil society organization. More autonomy results in more direct responsibility on the part of civil society organizations for implementing the outcome of a jointly organized dialogue between Governments and civil society. This explains why the current Chair-in-Office advocated for a continuation of this direct partnership in order to be able to determine the results of a major institutional change.

237. In conclusion, one Co-Chair reiterated that migration is an issue important to all Governments and that States therefore agreed to establish the Forum in order to be able to discuss the subject freely and informally. While the Forum is a State-led process, international organizations and civil society have been present from the outset. In this session, brainstorming was focused on how the participation of non-governmental partners could enrich the process in the future.

238. Governments will have the opportunity to continue the discussion in the Forum's Steering Group, which will be the main body charged with determining the characteristics and features of the Forum in the future. The Friends of the Forum also provides a space where non-governmental participants can provide inputs for the Forum. The discussion is far from being over. The work will continue during the year, preparatory to the Forum meeting in Mauritius.

## VIII. Closing session

239. The concluding session of the 2011 Forum's concluding debate began with the report of the cluster rapporteurs on the working sessions and the report of the

Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Migration and Development on the special session on the Forum Assessment (phase I). In his capacity as Chair, Mr. Gnesa then presented the conclusions of the 2011 Forum meeting. This was followed by a brief handover ceremony for the incoming Presidency of the Forum, the Government of Mauritius; a statement by the incoming Chair, Ali Mansoor; and a closing address by the State Secretary Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Peter Maurer.

240. Acting as cluster rapporteurs were Nahida Sobhan, Minister, Permanent Mission of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, for cluster I; David DiGiovanna, Deputy Counsellor, United States Mission to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, for cluster II; and Kaçim Kellal, head of the Department of International Affairs and Solidarity Development, Ministry of the Interior and Immigration, France, for cluster III. Their respective reports containing the summaries of discussions and the recommendations of the working sessions can be found in annex F to the present report, available online.

241. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for International Migration and Development reported on the results of the special session on the Forum Assessment (phase I). He referred to the history of the Forum, including the context of conceptual and ideological differences within which it had been created in 2006. The Forum was a compromise intended to overcome these difficulties. However, despite the fragility of the Forum process, its lack of an institutional base and its unpredictable funding mechanism, the Assessment results proved that it has been a remarkable success. The Assessment exercise showed the overwhelmingly positive responses of 66 Governments, where over 80 per cent of the respondents believed that the Forum had added significant value and contributed in one way or another to the assistance of migrants and to development policymaking. Eighty-seven percent of the respondents expressed overall satisfaction with the Forum process.

242. Mr. Sutherland highlighted the role of the Forum Steering Group members and the contributions that the United Nations institutions can make through their involvement. He urged the Global Migration Group to deliver more goals for the Global Forum as a collective institution while giving due regard to the contributions of certain members of the Global Migration Group. He drew attention to the continuing challenges of the Forum, in particular the lack of sustainable funding and of a mechanism that can ensure the future of the process, and the need to better engage the civil society. In this regard, he was grateful for the offers of certain Governments to host future Forum meetings, and was optimistic that the upcoming High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2013 would produce new ideas and better approaches, without institutionalizing and undermining the informal and voluntary nature of the process.

243. On the substantive front, he believed that the Forum could address many other global concerns, including the issue of stranded migrants in conflict situations, the modern-day slavery embodied in the Kafala system, and the implementation of the Domestic Workers Convention. He concluded that the Forum process has brought concrete results which have been generally satisfactory to States Members of the United Nations.

244. Mr. Gnesa, 2011 Forum Chair, recognized and thanked all Co-Chairs, rapporteurs and others who had managed skilfully the various sessions of the concluding debate. The two-day discussions had been particularly fruitful because of the rich, concrete and practical insights brought to the debate by 14 thematic workshops held around the world. As a result, about 160 States and 30 observers have learned from each other and built new partnerships.

245. He highlighted three key points that had come out of the concluding debate. First, the Common Space offered a unique opportunity for Governments and civil society to identify some common ground in respect of possible alternative responses to irregular migration, including through sustainable development, job creation and the opening up of more legal avenues for regular migration, or by means of regularization and reducing the demand for irregular migration. Second, the six working sessions had yielded multiple findings and outcomes which constituted the core of the 2011 Forum concluding debate, and which could be pursued with a view to generating further actions at the next Global Forum meeting. Third, the Forum Assessment exercise had reached a number of conclusions, foremost of which was the confirmation by an overwhelming majority (80 per cent of the responding Governments) that they were generally satisfied with the Forum process.

246. The special session on the Platform for Partnerships confirmed its usefulness as an online and offline tool for showcasing practices on migration and development, and promoting networking and partnerships. The session also discussed the progress of the three Platform kick-off projects, which had been launched in 2010 in Puerto Vallarta.

247. The last special session, on the "Relationship between the GFMD and non-governmental Partners", confirmed the important roles that international organizations and civil society play in the Forum: they help Governments translate Forum outcomes into reality, and are an integral part of the national, regional and global debates and actions on migration and development.

248. The Chair expressed the hope that the key highlights of the two-day debate will serve as a means of guiding Governments as they move forward with their own migration and development practices and policies. He reiterated that, in the final analysis, it is the many migrants and their families at home and abroad that benefit the most from more coherent and effective policies. Every migrant protected is a community strengthened, and development in a poor country also means development in a rich country. In this sense, Governments are bound together more than ever, in a flatter, globalized world, by common aspirations, common hopes for a better life, and common challenges. The Global Forum can in this regard help Governments and non-government stakeholders find collective solutions to their mutual concerns and continue to share wisely the common space in which they live.

**Brief handover ceremony**

249. After the Chair's conclusions, a brief ceremony was held for the handover of the Forum Presidency to the Government of Mauritius. The outgoing Chair acknowledged that Mauritius has been a mainstay of the Forum process from the outset, and that despite its small size it has had a large-sized and coherent migration story to tell. He presented Ali Mansoor, Financial Secretary of Mauritius and 2012 Chair, with a special plaque bearing inscriptions for all the Chairs of the Global Forum from 2007 to 2011. Switzerland had prepared this plaque in order to duly

remember, by inscribing in stone, the efforts and commitment of all those Chairs beginning with the first Forum meeting, held in Brussels in 2007. The plaque, with ample space left, will be passed on to future Forum Chairs. He then invited the 2012 Chair to deliver a statement.

250. Mr. Mansoor first congratulated the Government of Switzerland, particularly Mr. Gnesa, for the excellent work carried out by its Task Force, which had made 2011 a rich and dynamic year for the Global Forum. He then complimented the Chair for steering the first phase of the Forum Assessment and bringing it to a successful conclusion. He also welcomed the offer of the Government of Turkey to host the meeting of the Forum in 2015.

251. Mr. Mansoor anticipated that the 2012 meeting of the Forum will be held in Mauritius on 21 and 22 November 2012. Assisting the 2012 Chair will be Shree Servansing, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations Office and the international organizations in Geneva, who will steer the second phase of the Forum Assessment and lead the coordination efforts in Geneva.

252. The 2012 Chair affirmed the need to tackle the challenges and build upon the successes of past Forum meetings — in terms of both process and substance — while maintaining the central focus on the promotion of well-being of migrants. The new Chair, will try to lead the Forum by building a series of bridges — bridges linking the Forum's past to its future; bridges between Governments and non-State actors, particularly civil society as well as the private sector; and, finally, bridges between the Forum and the ongoing processes at both national and regional levels.

253. He announced that the work programme of the 2012 Forum meeting will be finalized through a broad consultative process, involving Governments and non-government partners. In early December, a draft concept paper with a survey form will be circulated to member States to enable them to communicate their views and proposals. On 18 January 2012, the Government of Mauritius will organize a brainstorming meeting among Governments in that country, to be followed by a consultation with the non-governmental actors and the civil society on 19 January. The first round of preparatory meetings of the Forum Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum will then be held, in Geneva, on 6 and 7 February, respectively.

254. Mr. Mansoor was optimistic that the 2012 Forum meeting will not only bring the Global Forum to Africa, but also encourage greater involvement by Africa in the process. For this purpose, he believed that the Forum should start thinking about a multi-annual framework, which will allow engagement between Governments and other actors like the civil society on common practical programmes. He was also of the view that the Forum funding mechanism should be less ad hoc and more predictable and practice-oriented. He saw the need for a more solid framework based on a clear, practical agenda and a multi-year mechanism for both action and funding. He stressed the critical role of international organizations in this regard.

255. In his closing remarks, Mr. Maurer commended Switzerland's entire Task Force, including its advisers and the Forum Support Unit, for their hard work in 2011. Given the voluntary nature of involvement in the work of the Forum, the 2011 Forum meeting had successfully demonstrated that there is sufficient political will and personal commitment to continue the Forum as a unique global process.

256. He observed that Governments had openly discussed on a global level some potentially sensitive issues like irregular migration and labour-market planning. Considering that there had been no global platform on migration issues five years before, he considered the participation of about 160 States in the 2011 concluding debate as indicative of a remarkable success. He thus underlined the need to preserve the informal and non-binding character of the Forum, which affords Governments and other stakeholders a space for trust-building, and for open and frank debate.

257. He also underscored that the nature of the Forum's relationship with the United Nations could not be characterized as "either-or", as some have claimed, but rather as "as-well-as". He believed that an efficient global dialogue on migration and development needed both a platform for operational and informal dialogue like the Forum, and a platform for political dialogue and stocktaking like the High-level Dialogue. The United Nations and the Global forum complemented, rather than competed against, each other.

258. Mr. Maurer concluded that the Forum has become a crucial part of the international dialogue on migration and development; but inasmuch as the Forum was the only regular and global platform for exchanges on migration and development, all stakeholders should assume responsibility for its welfare and strive to make it even better. On this note, he expressed confidence that the Forum process will continue and thrive in the capable hands of the Government of Mauritius in 2012.

## IX. Conclusion

259. Over the past five years, the Forum has sought to contribute to greater policy coherence on migration and development at the national, regional and global levels, strengthen the capacity of States to address migration and development opportunities and challenges more effectively, and promote international cooperation and partnerships among States and between States and other actors.

260. Each annual meeting has deepened the understanding of the complexity that characterizes the migration-and-development nexus, and each meeting has created a basis for Governments, international organizations and civil society to deal more effectively with these challenges. Over time, the Forum has also shaped the global agenda on migration and development; and through its inclusive approach, ongoing consultations and follow-on activities, it has also evolved into a process rather than just an annual conference.

261. In 2011, the Chair took the Forum one step further. Under the overarching theme of "Taking action on migration and development: coherence, capacity and cooperation", 14 small and practice-oriented thematic meetings had been organized in different parts of the world, so that participants could benefit from the concrete experiences of migration and development practitioners on the ground and feed the wealth of new knowledge and understanding of practices produced by these meetings into a global two-day concluding debate at the end of the year.

262. This new approach in preparing an annual full Forum meeting could be achieved only because of the commitment and support that so many Governments, international agencies and other partners provided to these thematic meetings, which

involved 1,200 participants from Governments, international organizations and civil society. Three Government teams subsequently coordinated the three cluster summaries reflecting the content and outcomes of the thematic meetings. The Chair wishes to renew here his profound gratitude to all those who had contributed to this process.

263. By discussing such themes as labour mobility and development; addressing irregular migration through coherent migration and development strategies; and tools for evidence-based migration and development policies, the 2011 Forum also took further a series of issues that had been addressed in earlier meetings, but which required more in-depth review and analysis. This was especially relevant in a year that had seen a deepening of the economic crisis, and of social and political unrest in certain parts of the world, which also affected the situation of millions of nationals and migrants, and confronted Governments and other actors with new challenges.

264. The debate on irregular migration and development was particularly timely, as it allowed a deepening of the dialogue among origin, transit and destination countries and such critical questions to be addressed as migrants' rights and protection, law enforcement and inter-State cooperation and partnerships in a context of development. The discussion on labour migration and development sought to engage more actively the private sector and also focused on the crucial issues of global care workers, lowering the costs of migration, skills development, and regulating recruitment processes. Progress was also made in taking further practices and concepts related to the tools that can facilitate the factoring of migration into development planning, including migration and development mainstreaming processes, extended Migration Profiles and policy impact assessments.

265. The 2011 Forum also saw a further strengthening of consultation and cooperation with international organizations, in particular the Global Migration Group, and with civil society. The Common Space arrangement, launched at the 2010 Forum meeting, was pursued and enabled participants to enjoy a useful exchange of different opinions and perspectives. This meaningful mechanism should be maintained, but certain adjustments may be required to ensure a more focused and better-structured debate.

266. Of key importance in 2011 was the first phase of the Forum Assessment process. Following the adoption of the two-year assessment framework at the 2010 Forum meeting in Puerto Vallarta, the 2011 Chair had guided this process in conjunction with a small assessment team, which produced a comprehensive Assessment report reflecting the responses to a survey focusing on the way in which the Forum operates. The overwhelmingly positive responses on the usefulness and value added of the Forum are proof that the process has come to play a critical role in the global debate on migration; but the Chair is also aware that the Forum is a work in progress and that serious attention must be given to improving its functioning in certain areas, including funding, enhancing the quality and concrete usefulness of its thematic outcomes, and consolidating the process as the only global platform for multilateral discussion of the migration-and-development agenda. The 2012 strategic and political analysis of possible options in respect of the Forum's future will thus be of paramount importance.

267. The Government of Switzerland will contribute its experience of chairing, and its political and substantive vision of the multilateral migration-and-development dialogue, to the Forum as it further evolves. It also expresses its deep-felt appreciation to all Governments and other partners that contributed to a work-intensive, productive and successful Forum process in 2011.